The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JANUARY 24, 1920 No. 2847

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 93

EDITORIALS:
- The Unfettering of Russia 96
- The United States and the New Europe 97
- The Banks and the Treasury 98
- Mr. Bryan to the Front Again 98
- Humor and Headlines 99

THE FAILURE OF THE MELTING-POT. By an Unassimilated Foreigner 100

BRITAIN'S BUILDING TRADES PARLIAMENT. By Malcolm Sparkes 102

OSLER. By William S. Thayer 104

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:
- National Problems in Local Settings. By William MacDonald 107

RUMINATIONS. By Oscar C. Williams 108

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 108

CORRESPONDENCE 109

LITERATURE:
- Cross-Sections. By George F. Whicher 111
- Labor in the Commonwealth 112
- The Riddle of Albania 113
- Toward Irish Unity 113
- A Chosen People 114
- Psychiatry and War 114
- History and Romance 115

BOOKS IN BRIEF 116

DRAMA: The Cult of Violence. By Ludwig Lewisohn 118

HISTORIANS and POLITICAL SCIENTISTS AT CLEVELAND. By W. M. 118

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 120

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 121

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ARTHUR WARNER, Associate Editors — FREDA KIRCHWEY, MABEL H. B. MUSSEY

CARL VAN DOREN, Literary Editor

Subscription Rates—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swarthmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

THE Index to Volume CIX of THE NATION *is now ready. It is sent to all libraries on the subscription list, but to other subscribers only upon request, which should be made at once to the Subscription Department.*

IT was not to be expected that the elections to the French Senate would show any marked change of public opinion in France. Like the Presidential election, the French senatorial elections are indirect. Senators are chosen in each Department by electoral colleges made up of Departmental and cantonal councillors, delegates from the municipalities, and Deputies. This indirect vote assures the preponderance of the rural voters and guarantees the conservatism of the upper chamber. Never in the past have the Socialists so much as proposed a candidate for the Senate. This year, however, their remarkable successes in the municipal elections gave them courage to present candidates in three or four Departments, and for the first time a Socialist will sit among the elders in the Palais Luxembourg. Otherwise the Senate appears to be little changed. It is not a very interesting body in ordinary times, but the new Senate has a special importance because it is to sit as a High Court to try for treason Joseph Caillaux, sometime Premier of France, Minister of Finance in the first Clemenceau Cabinet, and leader of the Radical party, and more recently partisan of an early compromise peace and a bitter personal enemy of Clemenceau and Poincaré. The cable dispatches throw little light on the probable attitude of the Senate in the "Caillaux affair," which bids fair to rival the Dreyfus trial as a storm center of French politics. The election by the Senate of its presiding officer gives the only hint: both De Selves, whose resignation as Minister of Foreign Affairs precipitated the fall of the Caillaux Cabinet in 1912, and Dubost, the retiring President, who is hostile to Clemenceau, were defeated, and the relatively colorless Léon Bourgeois was chosen.

THE withdrawal of Premier Clemenceau from the French Presidential contest, after unexpected defeat in the caucus and with the certainty of rejection if his name were presented at the formal balloting, probably marks the end of his public career. Mr. Hyndman, writing M. Clemenceau's biography a year or so ago, found few words save those of praise for his friend and hero, and there are doubtless many in France and elsewhere who agree with him. History, we think, is likely to appraise M. Clemenceau's public services differently. The "Tiger" was never, throughout his long career as politician and publicist, an intellectual force, nor had he, for the most part, the ability to work harmoniously with any party or group unless he himself could lead. In an age which developed social consciousness and the coöperative spirit to an unprecedented degree, he continued to the last an individualist, thinking his own narrow thoughts, forming his own near-sighted schemes, and hammering his way to leadership in a rough and brutal fashion which indeed made him feared, but which won no semblance of affection save among such as lacked breadth of vision as well as the finer elements of culture and taste. So long as France was faced by mortal peril, his ruthless vigor and single purpose stood the country in good stead; and his name will be placed high in the list of those to whom France, and the Allies as well, owe their salvation. But once hostilities were over and the building of peace began, the rugged leader who had devoted himself to making war became the evil genius, not alone of France, but of Europe and of half the world. The vindictive harshnesses of the armistice and of the later treaties had his full support, and his treatment of the defeated nations and their representatives savored to the last of the mind and manners of a bully rather than of the courtesy of a gentleman. The world will breathe easier now that France itself has rejected him, even though the injuries to democracy and world peace of which he was a leading instigator be long in healing.

ORGANIZED labor in Spain is not inclined, apparently, to accept without resistance the suppression of its organizations and the arrest of its leaders. Recent attempts on the part of the Government to end the industrial disturb-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ances by repressive methods appear only to have added to the gravity of the situation. In all the provinces workers continue to leave their work as a protest, and a protest strike of railway employees was announced for January 20. The Government has closed the syndicalist headquarters at Barcelona, but the syndicates continue to act secretly. A press dispatch of January 13 reports the arrest at Barcelona of sixty-eight syndicalist workers' delegates, but there is little reason to believe that these arrests will be any more effective in ending the disturbances than have been similar arrests in other parts of Spain, where conditions are as unsettled and threatening as they were before. An uncertain factor in the situation is the attitude of the army. Recent attempts to control the *juntas*, or military unions, have proved disastrous to the Government and created antagonism among army officers. The final overthrow of the De Toca Ministry, it will be remembered, was brought about by the attempt of the Government to reinstate at the military school students whom the officers had dismissed for refusing to join their *junta*. Although controlled by the *juntas*, the army has never sympathized with the syndicalists, but since its recent clashes with the officers' unions the Government has been making extensive use of civil guards instead of regular soldiers at Barcelona and elsewhere. The pressure of events is apparently aiding the proposed consolidation of the conservative political forces, and there are now rumors of the formation of a strong monarchist party to fight radicalism.

A FINAL settlement of the Adriatic problem has been outlined and discussed in the press for two weeks past. As early as January 8, *La Nacion*, of Buenos Aires, published the substance of a memorandum said to have been submitted to the Italian Foreign Minister by Great Britain, France, and the United States. According to the terms of this document, Italy was to receive in full sovereignty the islands of Pelagosa, Lissa, and Lussin, as well as Avlona and a piece of its hinterland. Italy was also to be granted a mandate over Albania, while the decision regarding Italian influence in Zara was to be "left to the population of that city." As for Fiume, it was proposed to maintain the city as a neutral area under the protection of the League of Nations, and to preserve its Italian character. Recent reports from Paris, without going so fully into detail, tend to support the general proposals said to have been submitted to M. Scialoia. An additional concession to Italy in the form of a strip of coast connecting Fiume with Istria has properly met with opposition from the Jugoslavs, and no final decision appears so far to have been reached. In the meantime, Fiume is in the hands of its "deliverer," Captain d'Annunzio, and uncertainty as to its fate is helping to increase unrest and disorder in Italy.

THE situation in Germany is one of uncertainty and menace. While Berlin and the other areas of disaffection are quiet under the menace of Noske's guns, the quiet can be counted upon to last only so long as those guns are held in readiness. Severe weather, the lack of fuel, and an acute potato shortage are playing into the hands of the extreme elements, and the ruthless measures of the Government in its suppression of the demonstration of January 13 have served only to increase the unrest. Four papers have been suspended, martial law has been declared in several cities, and the country has been thrown into a painful attitude of waiting. The Shop Councils bill, which was the occasion of last week's uprising, has passed the Reichstag by a vote of 213 to 64. The trouble may blow over as revolutionary clouds have done before, but a more acute food shortage is predicted for March and April, and unless the Allies take steps to organize food relief on a large scale they will be playing into the hands of the extremists as they have hitherto done in Russia. Meanwhile, official Germany is puzzled over the arrival at Berlin of an American diplomatic agent, Mr. Ellis L. Dresel. Since the State Department has announced that the armistice still governs the relations between the United States and Germany, the German Government is reported to have decided that for the present it will not take official cognizance of the American Commissioner's presence in Berlin.

AS the *World* remarked the other day, the process of Americanization in New York has been going on rapidly during the past week. Before we are done with it, some notion of the meaning of American institutions may penetrate the minds even of Speaker Sweet and his associates, who are for barring the five Socialist Assemblymen because of disagreement with their political and economic ideas. For that is what it comes down to. No informed man suspects the Socialist party of preaching or practicing violence. In its reliance on political action it is of the most straitest sect of the Pharisees; but it is frankly subversive of the existing economic order, which it holds responsible for the war, as do many eminently respectable authorities. On this ground Mr. Sweet undertook to outlaw it. His undertaking outraged intelligent Americans of every shade of economic opinion; hence a clumsy effort at Albany to lug in charges of personal unfitness against the Socialists. Meanwhile, labor everywhere protests vigorously. The press reassumes its historic function of criticism, the Associated Press bringing astonished comment even from two newspapers in Buenos Aires. Mr. Hughes again puts the public in his debt by a crushing attack on the action of the Assembly; and under his leadership the State Bar Association of New York, by a vote of 131 to 100, refuses so much as to condone the proceedings thus far by suspending judgment until all the case is in. Irrespective of the outcome of the pending action at Albany, Speaker Sweet and his supporters seem in a fair way to receive the castigation their performance so richly merits.

HERETIC hunters in New York, clerical and lay, have been having an exciting time pursuing the Rev. Percy Stickney Grant, whose church supports a forum to which radicals resort, who let the Christmas Day petitioners for the release of American political prisoners assemble at his parish house, and who warmly denounced the deportation of Russian Reds as un-American and unworthy, in a way comparing the "Ark" to the Mayflower. As to the latter, it appears that he was misunderstood; yet a remote comparison does hold. Waiving that, however, it is a pleasure to record that Mr. Grant's vestry has stood squarely behind him and guaranteed him complete freedom of speech. More than that, one of the vestrymen, no less a person than Mr. Thomas L. Chadbourne, who has been a staunch supporter of President Wilson, a large contributor to Democratic campaign funds, and a brilliant worker in high office at Washington during the war, is reported to have declared that he will put his whole fortune, if necessary, behind Dr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Grant. Yet further, Mr. Chadbourne agrees with his rector in denouncing the deportations as un-American, monstrous, and futile. If, as has been intimated, the case is to be laid before Bishop Burch on ecclesiastical grounds, the Bishop will find himself on trial as to his Americanism, his sanity, his tolerance, and his liberalism. Dr. Grant is a difficult man to handle, for he sticks to his guns, he comes from a family which settled here in 1630, he is steeped in the New England tradition, and he can puncture to the king's taste the follies of the hour. In an admirable public statement, he dares to quote Wendell Phillips thus: "The community which does not protect its worst and most hated member in the free utterance of his opinions, no matter how false or how hateful, is only a gang of slaves."

THAT the permanent injunction recently granted by Judge Webster of the State Superior Court at Spokane, Washington, prohibiting further activities of the I. W. W. and making membership in that organization contempt of court, is a denial of the right of trial by jury, is frankly and cheerfully admitted by the Spokane *Spokesman-Review*. As *The Nation* has already pointed out, the legal way to deal with the I. W. W., in Washington as elsewhere, is to prosecute under the criminal law any individuals who violate the law. It is contrary to all established principles of jurisprudence to suppress an organization by injunction on the ground that otherwise some of its members might commit crimes. "Under the county prosecutor's plan," the *Spokesman-Review* explains, "made possible by the granting of a permanent injunction, no juries are required. A man is found to be a member of an I. W. W. local, or is distributing literature, or otherwise aiding the revolutionist propaganda. He is brought before the bench of the Superior Court and punished, if the charges against him are sustained, for contempt of court. He may be sent to jail for as much as a year. His rights are safeguarded to the extent that he may appeal to the State Supreme Court, but he does not have a jury trial." The *Spokesman-Review* adds that if the injunction is enforced "it will work much more swiftly and effectively than the State criminal syndicalism law." No doubt it will; autocracy has always been swifter and more effective than democracy. The jury system is admittedly slow and cumbersome, but a belief that it was a bulwark against executive and judicial tyranny led our forefathers to include it among the guarantees of the Federal Constitution. There probably are some people who still believe in it even if the Washington court, apparently, and the *Spokesman-Review* do not.

THE alarming extent to which the employment of child labor increased during the war is shown in a report just issued by the Children's Bureau of the Federal Department of Labor. The setting aside by the Supreme Court, in June, 1918, of the Federal Child Labor law on the ground of its unconstitutionality was promptly followed by the restoration of the longer working hours for children which a number of State laws sanctioned; while the demand for child labor, joined to abnormally high wages under war conditions, caused even the State laws to be extensively violated. In one State forty-seven out of fifty-three factories were found to be violating the law by employing children under twelve years of age; in another, where the minimum age for employment in canneries was fourteen years, 721 children under that age, including fifty who were less than ten years old, were working in canning establishments in the summer of 1918. Some check to the evil was given when the War Labor Policies Board made compliance with the standards set by the Federal Child Labor law a condition in government war contracts made after the date of the Supreme Court decision. An investigation of the shipbuilding plants on the Atlantic Coast, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Great Lakes, however, undertaken in the winter and spring of 1919 in coöperation with the Emergency Fleet Corporation, showed numerous violations by important establishments of both State and Federal standards. Illiteracy among American-born children, too, is still alarmingly great. In five States which the Children's Bureau investigated, 19,696 children between fourteen and sixteen years of age were found to whom work certificates had been issued. Of that number, more than one-fourth could not write their names legibly; nearly 10 per cent. had not gone further than the first grade; more than half were in the fourth or some lower grade when they left school; only about 3 per cent. had reached the eighth grade, and only about 1 per cent. had gone as far as the high school. Of the 19,696 children, only twenty-four were foreign born. It is disheartening to learn that, in this enlightened country, large numbers of children still lack even elementary preparation for citizenship.

PRESIDENT BUTLER'S informing annual report, while recommending a substantial increase in the salary schedule at Columbia, at the same time presents certain historical facts which throw upon the increase (actually put into effect January 1) an unexpected light. Hardly a college professor in the country but will think that the new Columbia scale of $6,000 to $8,000 for professors, $4,500 to $5,000 for associate professors, $3,000 to $3,600 for assistant professors, and $2,000 to $2,400 for instructors, is a generous provision. And yet in 1876 the salary of a professor at Columbia was fixed at $7,500 and that of a tutor at $2,000! This means, since the great majority of professors will now receive only $6,000, at least for a time, that there has been an actual decrease of 20 per cent. in the amount paid, although since 1876 the cost of living has certainly doubled. With this situation at the largest and richest of American universities in the largest and richest American city, compare the case of the University of Washington, just now set forth in an admirable report made to the President and Regents by the Association of Instructors. There, the average salary of a professor is $3,172, that of an instructor $1,648. Compared even with the salaries paid by other universities of approximately equal rank, these salaries are low; but they appear still lower when compared with the earnings of twelve selected trades at Seattle on the basis of the union scale. Only waiters earn less than University of Washington instructors, who, however, accept no gratuities; but milk-wagon drivers receive more than the average instructor, and bricklayers and plasterers get $2,700 as against $1,648. Salary increases, averaging 4 per cent. a year since 1914, have of course not nearly kept up with the increase in living costs in Seattle, which is an expensive city. So the degradation goes on. Is the American professor to sink to that estate occupied by the English clergyman in the early eighteenth century, who was lucky to have forty pounds a year as a vicar, or as a chaplain was expected to retire from his patron's table when the dessert came on?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Unfettering of Russia

At last comes the news from Paris for which liberals the world over have been praying. The Supreme Council has finally reversed its position in regard to Russia, and has altered its policy just when it seemed as if it were to engage once more in the folly of war. To a limited degree there has been lifted from the Russian people the blockade which five arrogant world rulers imposed when it became clear that the Russian revolution was not going to assume the form that suited them, but instead had taken new and to them alarming shapes. Ever since the armistice, these men have been guilty of one of the greatest crimes in history—the continuance of the blockade against the starving people of Russia. They have shown no more compunction in warring against Russian women and children than they have in warring against German and Austrian women and children. The five men of Versailles, two of whom have now been retired to private life, could chart their course only by revenge, by politics, and, in the case of Russia, by fear. But now, again moved by fear, the Supreme Council has taken one step in the right direction, Clemenceau's opposition being unavailing partly because of his impending political extinction. This is one of the milestones of recent history; it means, as Mr. Hoover agrees, great things for Russia. It means much for the economic restoration of the Central Powers, upon which the whole safety of Europe now depends; even the Supreme Council is beginning to see this as it could not, in its pitiful blindness, a year ago. We are aware that this is but a beginning, and that the decision may be reversed—the Allies have had a new Russian policy with every moon. But we believe, with the outraged reactionary press, that this is the entering wedge and that out of it complete peace will come. We do not believe that business opinion will permit a resumption of the blockade, even if India's retention by England is at stake; we feel certain that humanity itself will forbid any such attempt. We rejoice that the Allies are to be freed from what has been a moral as well as a military disaster for them. We rejoice that, as now appears, Russia will be free to disarm, to restore the peace for which its people long, and to come to a decision, unaffected by foreign intervention, as to the kind of government the majority of its people desire. In addition to all this, we have the welcome news that all the American troops are to be recalled from Siberia at once.

Today, far sooner than anyone had dared to prophesy, the triumph of Lenin and Trotzky is complete. As far back as June 21 last, *The Nation* declared that the Allies were again betting on the wrong horse in Russia, and that the only question was when Kolchak would retreat to the Pacific. It is now admitted even by the British War Office that Kolchak has met with complete disaster. The costly supplies sent to him by the Allies, including, no doubt, the cargoes of rifles forwarded by the United States last summer, have fallen into the hands of the Bolsheviki; thousands of cars and hundreds of locomotives, of which they have stood in the greatest need, are in their possession; and Kolchak himself is reported to be a captive. So rapid, indeed, has been the victorious sweep of the Bolshevist forces that they now control practically the whole of the railway to Irkutsk, and this within sixty days after the fall of Omsk, 1,500 miles from Irkutsk. Denikin appears to have met a similar fate. His headquarters are now reported to be on a ship in the Sea of Azov. He has lost enormous quantities of supplies, and his army has been split into fragments and hopelessly dispersed. It may now be accepted as settled that the Allied and American attempts to overthrow the Bolsheviki by counter-revolutions have completely and finally collapsed.

Whatever may have been the real motive for the change of policy, it is too early to tell whether this partial holding out of the olive branch at Paris will suffice to prevent aggressive attacks by Lenin. The vanguard of the Bolshevist troops is reported to have reached Afghanistan. Russian armies stand at the doors of Persia; they are on the high road to Armenia and Turkey. Afghanistan and India are seething with revolution; English troops are fighting in both of those countries; there are serious disturbances in Persia. Should the Bolsheviki cross the frontiers with positive assurance that they were coming merely to free the peoples from British rule, the natives would rise as one man. We may be sure that Lenin, meantime, is thoroughly posted as to what is going on abroad. He knows full well the grave condition of British finances. He must have read the bitter attacks two months ago upon Mr. Winston Churchill for throwing away $75,000,000 worth of supplies upon Denikin in a final gamble. He knows that England could not move troops enough to Persia, Turkey, and Afghanistan to defend those fronts if they were quickly attacked. He has been aware from the beginning of the blunders at Versailles, and may well have laughed many times at the way the Supreme Council played into his hands. What is to hold back his victorious armies now? Not any fear, certainly, of English troops or of the Japanese. As for Poland, the War Department at Washington is said to be planning with the Allies to feed and arm that country, unmindful of the obvious fact that military intervention has thus far failed. If the Russian forces which so easily vanquished Denikin, and which are making light of a winter campaign, are thrown against the Polish frontier, Poland, with widespread social unrest to combat, will be overborne. Yet with it all, remembering the twenty-one peace offers made by Lenin to the Allies alone, it is yet to be shown that his spirit is not today more for peace than for war.

As for the extraordinary part which the United States has played in all this, nothing has so become the American adventure in Siberia as the manner of leaving it. For the good news that the repatriation of American soldiers is to begin as soon as transports can reach Vladivostok to move them and the remaining Czecho-Slovaks and Polish Legionaries, we give profound thanks. Some sense, it would seem, has at last come to Washington, some realization that the Siberian adventure was not only folly from a military point of view, but that it was also un-American, entirely contrary to the spirit of American institutions. The news that the United States is retiring will be received with gratification throughout the country. There is every reason why the United States should go on and make a complete peace, opening the vast markets of Russia to American business, and so putting an end to the sufferings of the Russian masses. Self-interest, sound statesmanship, the dictates of humanity, sound Christian policy toward our Russian fellow human beings, all point the way. It is time that the American crime against Russia finally and definitely ceased.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United States and the New Europe

WITH the formal exchange of ratifications of the Treaty of Versailles and the signing of the *procès-verbal* which puts the treaty into effect, history enters upon a new period. The war between Germany and the signatory Powers comes at last to an end. Diplomatic relations with Germany will now, presumably, be reëstablished, the various commissions provided for by the treaty for the execution of certain of its articles will be organized, and German prisoners of war who have been held in France or elsewhere will be sent home. Presumably, also, any German subjects who have continued to be interned, or in any way restrained in their freedom of movement, in any of the countries whose representatives have signed the *procès-verbal* must now be given their liberty. Precisely what personal or property rights are hereafter to be enjoyed by German citizens in the various Allied countries remains to be determined, but in any event such citizens may no longer be treated as alien enemies. A new international organization, also, the League of Nations, comes into existence; and before the League, once its various agencies are in working order, should be brought for adjudication not only most of the controversies which may arise over the interpretation or application of the treaty, but also other controversies that may endanger the peace of the signatory Powers or threaten war.

By no means all the world, however, is embraced in the peace that has formally been concluded or in the League of Nations that has been formed. The United States, Greece, Rumania, and China took no part in the recent ceremony at Paris, none of those countries having as yet ratified the treaty. The League of Nations, far from being a world league, is an aggregation of those Powers, great and small, which, by declaring war against Germany or by becoming in other ways directly involved in the war, took part in the Peace Conference and accepted the treaty which M. Clemenceau, Mr. Lloyd George, and Mr. Wilson framed; together with one or two neutral states which have voted to enter the League. All of the late enemy Powers are of course excluded, as are also Russia and a number of new Slav states to whose Governments the Supreme Council has as yet given no official recognition. Some twelve important countries, including four former belligerents, are not parties to the peace provisions of the treaty. The population of these countries, including their colonial possessions, is considerably in excess of 700,000,000; if the former Central Empires and Turkey are also included, another 100,000,000 at least must be added. A conservative estimate leaves two-fifths of the population of the globe outside of the League of Nations which has just been organized.

What, under such circumstances, is the outlook for world peace and reconstruction? Certainly the outlook is not bright. The League of Nations is made up of a small group of Great Powers and a larger group of smaller Powers, the latter more or less completely dominated by the former in political and economic matters; while within the League are to be found numerous alliances and understandings with no one of which, we may be sure, will the League have the courage to interfere. So far as the treatment of Germany is concerned, there is no new spirit in the League. In the note which was handed to Baron von Lersner by M. Clemenceau, on January 10, the Allies again solemnly aver that they "do not intend to injure the vital economic interest of Germany"; but the whole tenor of the armistice and the treaty, as of the acts and utterances of the Supreme Council, evinces a clear purpose not to preserve and rebuild, but to destroy. On the other hand, with the United States outside the League and not a party to the peace, the country which is admittedly the chief source of loans for the economic reconstitution of Europe is not represented at the council table, and can claim no prescriptive right to be consulted on either peace or war. The world is back upon the old system of alliances, as the brutal cynicism of M. Clemenceau desired that it should be; the only novel features of the League are its name and its pretensions.

The chief question for the United States is, of course, the bearing of the new international situation upon the position of this country as a world Power. We have more than once pointed out that the chief factor in bringing the United States to the unhappy position which it now occupies has been Mr. Wilson; we wish now to point out that he, if anyone, will also be the chief factor in keeping it there. In the exercise of his proper constitutional functions, Mr. Wilson has helped to frame and has signed a treaty with Germany, and has laid the treaty before the Senate. The Senate, also exercising its proper constitutional functions, has refused to ratify it. To whom belongs the next move? Clearly, not to the Senate; it is not the constitutional business of the Senate to frame a treaty, or even to announce what changes in a treaty which it has rejected it will accept if an amended treaty is submitted to it, although there is nothing to prevent it from adopting this latter course if it chooses to do so. Haggling with the President about reservations and amendments is unseemly even if not unconstitutional. Moreover, the treaty, having been rejected, is no longer legally before the Senate, but has reverted to the President. It is for the President to take the next step. He may resubmit the treaty if he is willing to risk a second rejection; he may inform the Senate of the changes which he thinks advisable or is willing to approve; or he may drop the old treaty and negotiate a new one. Until he acts, however, the Senate may rightfully wait.

If there is any sound defense of the course which Mr. Wilson has been pursuing, we have failed to note it. The attempt to saddle upon the Senate the responsibility for the present anomalous situation in world affairs is not statesmanship; the Senate has only exercised its constitutional discretion, and its course, even if mistaken, does not relieve the President of the obligation to act. No more statesmanlike is Mr. Wilson's apparent purpose to throw the burden of rejecting the treaty upon the Republicans; that is playing politics with the world's misfortune. What Mr. Wilson should do, without further delay, is to issue a proclamation declaring the war with Germany and Austria at an end, begin the negotiation of new treaties with those countries, and join with Congress in urging such changes in the covenant of the League of Nations as will make that organization a fit one for a democratic nation to join. The Treaty of Versailles, in the meantime, can be recognized as a valid agreement between the nations which have ratified it, in so far as the United States is concerned with any of its provisions, but with the distinct announcement that the United States accepts neither advantage nor responsibility under it. The burden will be upon the President, not upon the Senate, if the present state of war with Germany and Austria continues.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Banks and the Treasury

THE conditions of peace are production and justice. The politicians at Paris forgot them both, and tried to build peace on robbery. Already the results of their folly are apparent—economic warfare in almost every part of the world, threatened business collapse, and possible social disintegration. Rightly alarmed at the danger, a group of bankers and public men in the United States, Great Britain, France, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden have united to present a plan for setting the wheels of production again in motion. The question of justice they touch but lightly, yet they disclose an understanding of the present world situation that was denied to those responsible for the incredible folly of Versailles. "Only if we recognize," these men declare, "that the time has now come when all countries"—and all social classes, they might have added—"must help one another can we hope to bring about an atmosphere in which we can look forward to the restoration of normal conditions and to the end of our present evils." Normal conditions in the old sense, we believe, never can be and never ought to be restored; in the sense of peaceful inter-class and international relations they can be restored, or rather established, if and when the peoples get back to production on the basis of justice. The first necessary step under existing conditions is credit rightly directed. Where shall such credit come from?

The United States is the world's greatest reservoir of immediate productive power, and the world rightly asks us to produce and sell on credit; but it should be government credit in only very minor degree, if at all. The American people and the American bankers ought to get certain simple facts clearly in mind. During the war there was piled upon the backs of the American people a debt of $26,000,000,000, a light load when considered in relation to our wealth and resources and by comparison with the burdens of the European peoples, yet staggering in absolute amount. This debt includes practically $10,000,000,000 loaned to the Allies, which we shall get back some day—perhaps. For the present we are not getting even the interest on it; for the next three years, if the plans of the Treasury are carried out, the interest, amounting to $450,000,000 annually, is simply to be added to the principal. Further, the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Rathbone, has been for some time in Paris arranging for the refunding of the principal into long-term securities. The plain fact is that the European Governments cannot pay now; therefore our own Government is temporarily foregoing interest, and is arranging to extend the loans in hope of repayment later. The Treasury is calling for a billion and a quarter annually for the debt service.

In addition to the debt provision, we are expected to pay taxes of a billion and a half to maintain the army and navy—another result of the war that was to end war. Pensions and public works between them, in the ratio of about two to three, will call for another half billion, and a further billion will be demanded for other purposes, including the Shipping Board's estimated $448,000,000 and Departmental appropriations of $171,000,000. Altogether the country faces Federal taxes of more than four billion dollars, with no particular prospect of reduction. Customs duties during the calendar year 1919 yielded about $250,000,000, and there were miscellaneous revenues almost three times as great, while the miscellaneous internal revenue receipts lacked only fifty millions of reaching a billion and a half. Prohibition, however, will cut off almost a third of this latter income; the special war taxes have largely expired already; and when the excess profits tax disappears, as it seems likely to do, the weight of Federal finance will rest on the income taxpayer. The war has laid on him burdens that are heavy enough, without further debts.

There is, however, a source from which American loans may come even now, as witness the prompt absorption of the recent bond offering of the Belgian Government. The banks and private investors of this country have immense resources at command today. National bank resources rose during 1919 by $829,000,000 to a total of $22,444,992,000, and the gross earnings approximated a billion dollars. There has been an increase of more than ten million individual deposit accounts in these banks in ten years. The national banks, indeed, have grown more in the past six years than in the entire preceding half century since their establishment.

Business profits and bank earnings alike have been enormous throughout the war, the New York Federal Reserve Bank showing earnings of 130 per cent. on its capitalization during 1919. Meanwhile, as the *Commercial and Financial Chronicle* points out, the Federal Reserve system has done practically nothing to check dangerous credit expansion, and we have witnessed an orgy of speculation. American financiers and investors, accordingly, face a grave but simple problem. The Treasury is in no position to extend much further aid to a Europe stricken by the folly and wrongdoing of its Governments. If credit is to be granted, it must come mainly from private sources. Will American investors extend it, can they extend it, or will they rather scramble for profits in oil and steel and automobiles? If the latter, they will have none to blame but themselves should Europe fall into chaos.

Mr. Bryan to the Front Again

CAN Mr. Bryan come back? This is a question which a number of newspapers have been asking lately. To it we reply that Mr. Bryan is the one man in America who, for thirty years, has been an active political leader. There have been times when he was scarcely heard from on public issues, but he has never been in retirement. Only one other American political leader of this generation—Theodore Roosevelt—has had so large and devoted a personal following. His doctrine has often been unsound and his reasoning murky, but his democracy, his courage, and his honesty have never been challenged by the masses who so enthusiastically applaud him. It is worth while to take seriously his recent reappearance, and to observe whether there is anything in his platform which meets the need of the times or makes him a formidable candidate for the Presidential nomination.

Let it be said, first of all, that Mr. Bryan's position on the treaty has obvious practical advantages as against the intransigent attitude of Mr. Wilson. Entrance into the treaty controversy, however, will not necessarily enhance his chances of becoming the Democratic candidate for President. It may, by involving him in quarrels, work the other way. On the other hand, his declaration is not unlikely to make him the dominant influence in selecting the candidate

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who is to be chosen at San Francisco next June, just as he was in the convention of eight years ago that picked Mr. Wilson. That he should wield any such possible influence, it must frankly be said, is due much more to the lack of vital and controlling leadership in his own party than to the strength of any program which he appears to have outlined for the future. For his platform, one turns to his speech at the Jackson Day dinner, at Washington, and to an interview printed a few days earlier in the *Baltimore Sun.* In the light of present-day radicalism, as well as of the extraordinary need of the hour for sound and straightforward thinking on fundamental economic problems, Mr. Bryan's proposals are certainly disappointing; yet the fact that he unquestionably wields great political power, and that no one else appears to have advanced any reconstruction platform whatever, give to his utterances an importance which cannot be ignored.

At the Jackson Day dinner, in addition to his stand on the peace treaty, Mr. Bryan emphasized three proposals: a peaceway, a Federal-owned news bulletin under bi-partisan control, and the initiative and referendum. The proposed peaceway is a purely personal hobby, and the suggested government news bulletin will excite no enthusiasm when one recalls how the Administration debauched various of its information services for the spread of propaganda during the war. The demand for the initiative and referendum in national legislation, apparently, may prove popular. In the interview in the *Baltimore Sun,* Mr. Bryan spoke especially of requiring a referendum as a preliminary to a declaration of war—an excellent proposal which we hope will be written into the platform to be adopted at San Francisco. In the same interview he also reiterated his old and impractical idea of a railway system, partly State and partly Federal owned. It ought to be apparent at first glance that such a proposal is entirely impossible from the practical standpoint of railway operation and finance. More than that, Mr. Bryan would probably find, were he to examine the State Constitutions, that nearly half of them forbid the State ownership of railways or the use of State funds for railway construction. To suggest a plan that would necessitate the alteration of a number of these State Constitutions, is to suggest something that most practical people will condemn as visionary. Mr. Bryan, however, has never hesitated on the ground of mere impracticality, and there are doubtless many of his followers who will accept this proposal, as well as that for an extension of the initiative and the referendum, with enthusiasm.

Mr. Bryan's reappearance is well timed. Everywhere the people are calling for leadership, particularly the great masses to whom Mr. Bryan has always appealed. They are searching today as never before for a way out; at the same time they are not always well enough versed in political and economic matters to distinguish clearly the sham from the genuine. They know that they are being ground down, that, somehow, things are radically wrong; and many of them see in Mr. Bryan, whatever else may be said of him, a man who has always stood firm against certain powers of modern finance and capitalism which the people of the Middle West especially have long believed to be their chief enemy. One must not underestimate, accordingly, the influence which Mr. Bryan may wield this year, especially in view of the complete moral collapse of Mr. Wilson's leadership. All the greater, then, the pity that Mr. Bryan has given us no ringing utterance.

Humor and Headlines

THE war helped humor. Consider the *New York Times,* for instance, and the growth of the merry spirit with which its writers of headlines viewed the news passing daily under their rident fingers. How gaily they snubbed it, how robustly they sent it to Coventry, how expertly they cut it dead! Nor have they unlearned the jolly lesson. As late as June 22, 1919, they, or some inimitable fellow among them, set up the whimsical words "Urge Move to Halt Red Rule" over the news account of a signed statement made by ten eminent clergymen, urging men and women of good will to influence public opinion against "lawless measures by whomsoever they may be employed," and pleading that all accused persons be given a fair trial "so that it may be truly said that in America no man's case, be he an I. W. W. or a Bolshevist, or the most reactionary conservative, is prejudged by an appeal to popular feeling." No falling off here in the jocund habits which helped the *Times* win the war! And the spirit still survives. The issue for January 13 has a report of a speech by Judge Anderson of the United States District Court at Boston.

"There are Reds, probably dangerous Reds," said Judge Anderson. "But they are not half as dangerous as the prating pseudo-patriots who, under the guise of Americanism, are preaching murder and shooting at sunrise, and to whom our church parlors and other public forums have hitherto been open.

"Many, perhaps most, of the agitators for the suppression of the so-called Red menace are, I observe, the same individuals or class of forces that in 1917 and 1918 were frightening the community to death about pro-German plots. As United States District Attorney I was charged with a large responsibility as to protecting the community from pro-German plots. I assert as my best judgment that more than 99 per cent. of the pro-German plots never existed."

And the head is: "Declares Parlor Reds Most Dangerous Type." The *Times* will have its little joke.

Think what the present headline humorists of the *Times* could have done to Lincoln's Gettysburg address if they had been actively at work in 1863. "Cannot Dedicate Gettysburg Cemetery," we can imagine them as having written in some rollicking mood. Or in another and wittier vein they might have said: "Fathers Conceived and Brought Forth New Nation, Says President." Supposing their mirth had for the moment become a little irresponsible, what fun to say "President Urges Stamping Out Rebels," or, since the *Times* has always been what it would call "constructive not destructive," "Measures Needed to Increase Devotion to Union." One of these jesters might even have read the first sentence of the address quite, quite through, and have shared his discovery with the world in this language: "Questions Whether All Men Are Created Equal." Another of them could have found in the last sentence of the address its true essence and nub: "Government of People by People for People to Perish from Earth."

And yet injustice must not be done the *Times.* All praise is due it for its unvarying, unwearying habit and spirit of humor which keep its pages bright and blithe and unexpected. But sometimes the native metal must show through, and the *Times* is humorous unconsciously. More than likely its heavy headline on the Gettysburg occasion would have been "Everett Delivers Masterly Oration"; and a sub-head would have announced that "President Lincoln Also Spoke."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Failure of the Melting-Pot

By AN UNASSIMILATED FOREIGNER

TWENTY years ago I came to this country from one of the European states that America helped to final victory in the last war. If I am not a millionaire, I also am not a failure. After working as an employee and a small employer, I have accumulated a small competence. Neither am I a radical. I have a thorough command of English, and claim to know the political system of this country better than the average native-born American.

I never applied for second papers. Others placed in the same condition may plead lack of time or the cost of the procedure. I want to be candid in this matter. If a man fails to find within himself enough driving power to go of his own motion and get his second papers, it is because he feels that he does not wish to have them. After participating in the life of this country for the last twenty years, I have not lost the remembrance of the feeling of humiliation and revolt that I took away with me from Ellis Island. After twenty years the jostling, insults, brutality, graft, and robbery to which I had to submit stand before my mind as vividly as the day they were foisted upon me and shattered all the illusions that I had nursed for years by reading of this country and its opportunities.

Immediately upon arrival I took out my first papers as a matter of form and I made a brave effort to fit myself into my new surroundings. I made it a point never to mix with my former countrymen nor to read a paper in a foreign language. I wanted to be a good American, for I liked the many instances of wider freedom to be met in this land. There was no state church, with compulsory taxation for the upkeep of an institution which I hated; no compulsory military service to herd one into barracks where officers and "non-coms" had a practical right to insult and to brutalize. There were institutions of higher learning free and open to all, while in the old homeland none but the children of the wealthy could aspire to such a training.

My first disappointments were of the economic order. I was working in an Eastern mill as a common laborer and getting wages which, translated into European currency, would have meant wealth and comfort. But, unless I went to live with those of my countrymen who dwelt in crowded tenements under the most wretched conditions, and lived a squalid life to hoard every possible dollar, in order to become middle-class people in the old country by buying the tools and chattels of a tenant farmer or opening a store with their American earnings, I realized that I could make no headway financially. To live as an American meant that my entire wage would be absorbed. I realized then that, while I did not earn so much money in Europe, my small earnings there when spent at the coöperative store purchased more food and manufactured goods for daily use. While work was easier to obtain here, labor conditions seemed decidedly inferior. The hygiene of the shop was more neglected. Wages were subjected to compulsory deductions for hospital fees, cash discounts, company board and store bills, which, one and all, were permeated with graft. It became painfully evident that somebody was using the power which our need of a job within his giving vested in him to extort payments which were no compensation for genuine services rendered.

About that time came my first acquaintance with Americanism as a civic teaching. A young lady had been appointed as our instructor in English, American history, and civics. Economics was not included in the curriculum. Her method was rather mechanical and lacked conviction. The only time she warmed up to her subject was when she indulged in some bitter criticism of government ownership, with occasional references to socialism, the whole of it coupled with a clumsy eulogy of the company's resident stockholder. Americanism, according to her definition, meant the perpetuation, as permanent and immutable national traits, of the various characteristics distinctive of the pioneers during the period of individual competition and colonization from the shores of the Atlantic in the general direction of the Northwest. These traits she enumerated as follows: private property, parliamentary democracy, evangelical Christianity, and the monogamic home. She dwelt at length on the ethical side of Americanism, but I was considerably amazed that most of those ethical precepts were summarized in the language of the poker table. Still, at closer inspection, the different principles mentioned constituted a fairly good epitome of Americanism. I will, therefore, use my teacher's summary as the basis for mentioning my reasons for not taking out my second papers and for deciding to return to the land of my birth.

These fundamental American traits may have had a certain positive value in pioneering days. Today, with the free land all gone and the leading economic force in the nation shifted from extensive agriculture to mechanized industrial production, the maintenance of the morals of an elapsed economic period as permanent national traits can only have a negative purpose of social discipline, and is no longer conducive to national progress. The poker morality had its value in binding together a society of individual producers by the establishment of a discipline of competition. Our need today is a social conscience manifesting itself in usefulness and solidarity.

In the religious domain the unassimilated foreigner refuses to subscribe to the doctrines of nonconformity. He doubts the historical correctness of evangelical Christianity. He considers an intellectual endeavor to reproduce the historical conditions of primitive Christianity as an impossible attempt of historical gymnastics, and sees in the teachings of nonconformity not the genuine teachings of a laboriously reconstructed historical Christ, but the idealized form of what the ministerial profession deems the moral necessities of this particular age. In discarding her former mission of moral suasion to substitute therefor the punitive authority of the state, as in the case of prohibition, the church has acknowledged her own bankruptcy.

In the case of the monogamic home and the tendency of the state to uphold its tradition by precept and by force, we need only remember that all the functions of the home in the material domain a generation ago are now performed more efficiently by the organized commercial agencies of society, while many avenues of employment at good wages outside the home are beckoning to womanhood with offers of material independence based on economic self-support. Here again, to maintain the individual isolated home as a plant for the production of food, shelter, and clothing may be useful as a method of social restraint, but those

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who are not the beneficiaries of that restraint object to its permanence on the grounds of wastefulness and inefficiency.

The main cause for leaving the United States, however, is the genuine disappointment born out of the practice of political democracy. Abstract principles of liberty are attractive in their sonorous generality. They depend, however, for their full fruition upon organic dispositions which may, in a practical way, invalidate most of the grandiloquent principle and leave it in the shape of a conventional lie devoid of any genuine influence upon the concrete realities of life.

To begin with, no immigrant of European origin understands the American party system. Political parties in Europe are the expression of philosophical opinions and of their bearing upon human conduct, or the expression of deep lines of social cleavage practically expressed in men's attitude toward some fundamental economic proposition such as the mode of ownership of the tools of production and distribution. American political parties are essentially artificial groups without basic principles, the result of a hybrid conglomeration of historical traditions, more or less confusedly transmitted by inheritance for the rank and file, and of blatant professionalism for the leaders.

The first result of this political see-saw game has been a complete absence of political progress. The electoral system of the United States, once the most advanced in the world, is now the most backward and antiquated. It is still enirely based upon the notion of plurality. The necessity of an absolute majority for election is deliberately ignored. Chicago recently elected as mayor a candidate whose opponents had received nearly twice as many votes as himself. There is no proportional representation, no preferential voting, and the average citizen does not feel the desirability of a voting system affording a truer and more accurate expression of public opinion. The practical result of this antiquated electoral machinery is already with us in the shape of the notorious inferiority of our legislative personnel.

If legislating is becoming farcical on account of the inferiority of the legislative personnel, it also bids fair to become a joke from another point of view. The action of the majority of the House in denying his seat to Mr. Berger has set a dangerous precedent. As one who would in no circumstances vote for Mr. Berger, I have a right to say that the power of the House to refuse a seat does not involve the right to refuse a seat to a lawfully elected member as a censure upon his politics or the majority of the voters in his district. The British Parliament did that once in the case of Bradlaugh, and a few years later it unanimously and penitently ordered all reference to the incident expunged from the record. All over the world men convicted of political crimes are elected to legislative offices, and everywhere they are seated and the jail doors opened to them if they are confined. This rule works in all directions, and to ignore it in this country is merely to play into the hands of the opponents of political government.

Another American institution which the emigrant is both unable and unwilling to understand, both in the light of his acquaintance with representative government in his native land or on the merits of the issue as an abstract principle of public law, is the judicial veto. I am not concerned with the historical precedents in the matter. A library full of books has been written on the subject whether this power of the courts to declare laws unconstitutional was assumed or in line with the letter of the United States Constitution. The important fact for the average citizen is its exercise in our midst. The rupture of the equilibrium of the three powers of the state which were theoretically coördinate and equal in favor of the judiciary must be considered as a working and living policy. Whatever the mentality of the judge, whether he still lives in the intellectual atmosphere of individual competition and natural rights, or whether he is just a common purchasable scoundrel, the fact remains that every time that the judicial veto has been exercised, it has accomplished the one practical result of restoring the individual to that atomic impotency from which he was trying to escape by forming the associations and combinations which were declared illegal in the name of a Constitution based upon the contingencies of a mode of production which is no more.

The impotency and decay of parliamentary institutions open the door to the spontaneous formation of new and extra-legal organs of government as temporary or permanent expedients. The functions of the executives are daily increased by the commodious expedient of the legislator who transfers to the legislative authority of the executive all the problems which the legislator is unable or unwilling to solve. Throughout the country a new and sinister bureaucratic power is growing up. Minor officials intended by law to receive documents in a purely notarial capacity are taking it upon themselves to pass upon debatable questions of fundamental law. The Post Office, empowered by law to deny transportation in the mails to publications violating the common rules of decency, builds up a censorship of ideas and principles which Congress would not dare to corroborate in a positive legislative enactment. A new and extra-official body of law is being enacted under our very eyes and alongside our penal law under the guise of police practices.

Not only do the police openly sell the right to violate the law, but they have relinquished their mission to prevent and repress crime. The stool-pigeon system in use in all our large cities is a compromise with crime under which the duty which is the reason for the existence of the police is only accidentally fulfilled. Our various police departments have been allowed to build up under the guise of constructive misdemeanors a practice under which individual liberty has ceased to exist.

It is an elementary principle of law that a guilty act must include a material deed and a criminal intention. These elements are not present in the case of vagrancy, and arrests for such a cause are merely a matter of social preservation. The European lawmakers understood this, and surrounded the individual with adequate guarantees to protect him against the arbitrary exercise of police authority. In the more enlightened countries, for a period of one month after leaving the service of an employer, no man, even if he be picked up on the street penniless and homeless, can be charged with vagrancy. After being out of work for one month, he cannot be reputed a vagrant if he is penniless but in possession of satisfactory papers as a means of identification. Compare this procedure with that of the American police. Here is a crowd of workingmen filling the library of a radical club. Most of them have jobs, homes, and families. Suddenly the police swoop down upon the place, arrest everybody, and charge them all indiscriminately with vagrancy. The following morning most of the cases are dismissed in police court. Some of the men have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lost their jobs. Others have been missed by anxious relatives throughout the night. But the police have accomplished successfully through intimidation what they had no legal right to do. For a week or so the reading-room of the club will remain deserted. The same thing may be said about prosecutions for disorderly conduct. Men have been found guilty of disorderly conduct for every possible act which the police happened to disapprove of, without having a legal right to stop it or an existing statute under which they could secure a conviction. Suppression of free speech by the police is becoming a settled characteristic of American life. I have heard Americans on a Sunday afternoon in Hyde Park remark after listening to a republican orator: "If that man said only half as much about our mayor at home as he just said about the King, the police and their clubs would not give him a chance to tell the other half."

It is this experience of the immigrant with the practical working out of American constitutional rights in everyday life which is driving millions of our fellow-citizens back to the country from which they came. This determination has only been made keener by two recent legislative enactments: prohibition and woman suffrage.

Prohibition has increased the receptivity of the workers to the doctrines of the agitators. No attempts were made to offer substitutes for the saloon, and spontaneous effort failed to provide other forms of recreation for those who previously clustered around the public drinking-places. The men were not of a degree of intellectual development where artistic interests could have been kindled into recreations of a higher order. Never have they more deeply realized their social ostracism. In many cases it took the form of sullen brooding and aimless wandering through the city streets. Attendance at the factory may have become more regular, but the expected increase of efficiency has not materialized. The absorption of the compulsory savings of prohibition by higher prices has been the spark that has kindled the fires of social unrest. Strikes have taken a new form and a new aim. The tactics of the working class have been revolutionized. Organization along craft lines is losing ground to industrial organization, paralleling the whole fabric of industrial production and aiming not so much at an improvement of the condition of the workers under the existing economic order as at the overthrow of that order itself and the providing of a personnel capable of carrying on production on a collectivist basis, after the dispossession of the present owners.

To those who are aware of this situation indiscriminate woman suffrage has appeared as a reinforcement for conservatism along the electoral battlefront. The catchy platitudes that have been used to secure the franchise for women in the various states have been discarded. No longer do we hear that suffrage is innocuous because it would only double the vote of each party, nor that women might as well have a vote since they could not use it any worse than the men had done so far. It is now an experimental fact that woman suffrage is at least conservative, if not reactionary.

The recent immigrants who landed in this country to become industrial wage-workers, and frequently at the direct solicitation of industrial concerns, left behind them the narrowly parochial element of their nationalism. They are not cosmopolitans. They could easily be gained by a new and wider nationalism that would find the source of its strength in a wider outlook upon the whole world, and by the assimilation of what is best and noblest under all flags. But if the United States has only to offer them in practice all the abuses against which emigration from their ancestral soil was for them the only available form of protest, if these tendencies—at the very moment that they are being largely suppressed in Europe as the result of the political upheavals that marked the closing of the World War—are to be erected into the tenets of an immutable doctrine of Americanism, the inevitable conclusion will be: If this is Americanism, we want none of it.

Britain's Building Trades Parliament

By MALCOLM SPARKES

"THIS council is the outcome and expression of a desire on the part of organized employers and operatives in the building industry to render their full share of service towards the creation of a new and better industrial order." These words form the opening sentence of the preface to the constitution of the Industrial Council for the Building Industry (Building Trades Parliament)—the official title of the assembly that is making such progress toward industrial democracy. And they are probably unique in industrial history. A great staple industry, employing nearly a million men, has realized that the best people to rebuild its structure are the people who carry it on; and has set up a representative assembly for this express purpose. The central idea of each industry as a self-governing unit, almost unheard-of three years ago, is so simple and attractive that it carries everything before it, and already over forty industries in Great Britain have set up industrial councils which follow the builders' lead—although only at a very respectful distance in some cases.

It is true that the Building Trades Parliament ranks in official records as an ordinary Whitley industrial council, but it is recognized in many quarters as something much more that that. Not only is it the pioneer of the whole industrial council movement—for the scheme was adopted in the building industry before the Whitley report was published—it is, in fact, the only industrial council that has been set up by a large, highly organized, staple industry. The reasons for this lie in the origin, principles, and program of the scheme itself. In the first place, it arose within the industry itself and was not imported ready-made from a state department. It is a labor scheme—a great constructive proposal laid before the building trades employers by the twelve principal trade unions of the building industry —and was adopted on its merits.

Its aim is not, like the Whitley scheme, a "permanent improvement in the relations between employers and workmen," but, in the words of its constitution, "a new and better industrial order." The principles upon which it is based are also a departure in industrial development. Believing that the mighty forces of good-will, which are latent everywhere in human nature, can be effectually mobilized for the rebuilding of the industrial order, the scheme sets out to harness into one team for this common purpose those great powers of leadership and service that have been too long diverted into the sterile fields of largely useless controversy. Once more let us quote the constitution:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Industry needs no truce, no compulsory arbitration, no provisions for postponement of disputes. What it needs is confidence and a courageous forward movement, supported by the constructive genius of both sides in common counsel. Industrial peace must come, not as a result of the balance of power with a supreme court of appeal in the background. It must arise as the inevitable by-product of mutual confidence, real justice, constructive good-will.

The Building Trades Parliament consists of 132 members: sixty-six elected by the twenty-two trade unions of the building industry, approximately in proportion to their numerical strength; and sixty-six elected by the seventeen associations of building trades employers, roughly *pro rata* with the number of operatives normally employed by their members. The chairman is a member himself, and therefore has a vote, but not a deciding vote. No representatives are appointed by the state, the whole plan being essentially industrial self-government. It is the only industrial council that has omitted the word "joint" from its title, has set out to "realize the organic unity of the industry as a great national service," and has the courage to take decisions by majority of the whole council, instead of requiring a majority of the council on both sides, which is the ordinary Whitley council practice. This is a fundamental matter. The Whitley councils, as at present constituted, have recognized as permanent the very barrier between the two existing "sides" in industry that the industrial parliament scheme was designed to break and that the Building Trades Council has already broken, at any rate to some extent.

The cleavage of the future will be between the adventurous and the cautious, and not, as formerly, between employers and employed. Indeed, as will be evident from the composition of the council, any reappearance of the old cleavage would cause the machine to lock itself and become inoperative. Another feature in which the Building Trades Parliament is unique is its absolute exclusion of disputes. Its function is constructive and nothing but constructive; it is there to build the new industrial order, and for nothing else. Disputes must be dealt with, as heretofore, by the Building Trades Conciliation and Demarcation Boards (which are somewhat similar to the newly constituted American Board of Jurisdictional Awards) or by any other methods that may be thought to be advisable, not for a moment excluding strikes. Under no circumstances can the Building Trades Parliament arbitrate; but, although it cannot touch disputes, it can always bring forward constructive measures to remove their underlying cause.

With all its good points and its splendid spirit, the Building Trades Parliament does not, in itself, solve the great problem of the ultimate control of industry. But it is certainly an instrument—possibly the best instrument—for producing the solution. For the presentation and investigation of proposals; for discussion and for the education of opinion; for the compulsory code of agreed minimum standards and the voluntary code of industrial pioneering and advance; for all these, the Industrial Parliament provides the means, and there is no problem that will not yield before such methods applied with enthusiasm and good-will. The field of operation, as set out in the official program, is unlimited. In addition to the specific question of industrial control and the status of labor, it embraces scientific management and reduction of costs; prevention of unemployment; apprenticeship; technical training and research; safety and welfare methods; inclusion of all operatives and employers in their respective associations; closer association between industry and art.

But it is on the fundamental issue of control that the success or failure of the whole movement must be judged, for that is the crucial test. Will the Building Trades Parliament build the road to a real industrial democracy, or will it standardize the wage system and perpetuate the existing relationship of employers and employed? Already we have the first indication of the answer to this question. A committee of eight employers and eight employees, set up by the Building Trades Parliament "to consider the question of scientific management and reduction of costs, with a view to enabling the building industry to render the most efficient service possible," has presented an interim report* which is a veritable landmark in industrial history. With remarkable courage and insight it has reached the conclusion that the end in view cannot be fully attained except as the corollary of democratic control and organized public service.

The committee outlines proposals designed to lay the "true foundation for such a final consummation." It proposes that the overhanging fear of unemployment, which has had such a demoralizing effect on both the character of the workman and the quality of his work, shall be completely and finally removed, in order that he may whole-heartedly give of his best. To secure this it recommends that the industry should establish unemployment pay for the whole of its trade-union personnel, and that the necessary funds should be raised, as a first charge on production, by means of a weekly percentage on the wages bills, to be paid by each employer to a joint committee of employers and employees. Although collected by a joint committee, the unemployment pay is to be distributed by the trade unions, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Building Trades Parliament, the scale varying from full wages for a man with a wife and four children to half wage for a single man.

The committee then proposes that the rate of interest paid for the hire of capital in the industry should be limited —the scale to rise and fall with the average annual yield of the best Government stock—and that subject to certain conditions of approval and control, it should be guaranteed. It further recommends that all "owner managers" should receive salaries "commensurate with their ability," and subject to periodical revision by a joint committee. And finally it suggests that the surplus earnings of the industry should be publicly declared every year and devoted to common services controlled by the industry as a whole, through its industrial council. Such services would include the establishment of a great development fund for the industry, from which loans could be obtained by members; education and research; and superannuation schemes for the whole registered personnel of the industry.

The report is not unanimous. Five of the employers, while in agreement with some of the proposals, do not see their way to sign it without important reservations. But the first debate upon it in the Building Trades Parliament revealed a universal willingness to face large issues and a real desire on every hand to get at the true solution of the greatest problem of our time. The report was referred back to the committee for further investigation and development of the principles laid down. One of the greatest discussions in industrial history has begun, and, whatever the result, its educational value will be difficult to overrate.

*Interim Report on Organized Public Service in the Building Industry (Industrial Council for the Building Industry, 48 Bedford Square, London, W. C.)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Osler

By WILLIAM S. THAYER

AS the accumulating tragedies of the aftermath of war gather fatally one on another, a puzzle and a mystery to the thoughtless masses whose imperfect eyes seek in vain for the cause, the old dead ache that we have borne for these last interminable years, the old dead ache that it is our dream to outlive breaks out now and again in new and cruel crises. Such a crisis was the death of Sir William Osler, as much a tragedy of the war as if he had fallen by the side of his boy, "forward as fits a man."

Son of a canon of the Church of England, born in Bond Head, Ontario, in 1849, he was at the outset destined for the clergy, but his inclination carried him toward medicine, and after four years in Toronto and Montreal he graduated at McGill University in 1872. For the two years following he studied in London, Berlin, and Vienna, and in 1874 he returned as lecturer and later as professor of the Institutes of Medicine at McGill University. In 1884 he was called to the University of Pennsylvania as Professor of Clinical Medicine, and in 1889 to the Johns Hopkins University as Professor of Medicine and Physician in Chief to the Johns Hopkins Hospital. In 1905 he left America to become Regius Professor of Medicine and Student of Christ Church at Oxford. Such is a brief outline of his academic career. He held honorary degrees from a large number of American and foreign universities, and was a Fellow of the Royal Society.

In the two years spent in Europe he made important original studies on the blood. Wherever he went his devotion to work, his remarkable power of observation—for throughout his life he was an observer rather than an experimenter—his extraordinarily quick grasp of the significance of that which he saw or read, his clear vision and sound, sane judgment, his simplicity and sincerity and honesty impressed his colleagues and the public, and he came to be much sought for as a consultant.

In 1892, after a year of intensive work, he published his treatise on "The Practice of Medicine," which, largely because of its rare personal quality, because it represented the fruits of actual observation and experience, has been for so many years the standard text book of medicine in America. He delivered many lectures before learned societies, the Goulstonian lectures in 1885, the Cartwright lectures in 1886, the Harveian lecture in 1906. He published a number of short volumes on different medical subjects—chorea, cancer of the stomach, angina pectoris—and a very large number of notes on a great variety of pathological conditions observed in his constant clinical activities. He delivered many addresses and was the author of a considerable number of charming and valuable historical and biographical essays.

His work in the organization of the new medical clinic at the Johns Hopkins Hospital in 1889, his insistence that, for the proper care of the patient as well as for the improvement of the teaching of medicine, the student should be used, as in England and France, as an assistant in the wards, and his practical abandonment of the barren didactic methods were steps of great importance in the advancement of medical instruction and in the improvement of hospitals in America. These were notable achievements; they have been abundantly recounted in the last few weeks. But if one turn to the notes of those who knew him and were close to him, such as the tributes by eighteen of his associates in the *Johns Hopkins Hospital Bulletin* for July, 1919, he may perhaps be struck by the lack of stress laid on the scientific and material aspects of his work; for it was in the human side of this man that lay his true greatness. It is probable that there has, in America, been no medical man so universally revered, no man whose power, whose inspiration has reached so many, no man so loved. Wherein lay the secret of this power? What was the manner of the man?

His father was Cornish, and Osler was a true Celt. A Celt in appearance, not large, of a very dark, almost olive complexion, with a rather long, drooping black mustache—a Celt in his charming vivacity and brilliancy and in his sparkling wit. Not large, but well built, with a wiry, athletic figure, a long, swinging, active gait, a peculiarly mobile face, serious and almost stern when at rest, with deep, dark brown eyes with an irresistible humorous twinkle; deep clear eyes, so clear that although they might sometimes seem unfathomable, they told at a glance of a pure, kindly, loyal spirit behind. As a teacher he was wholly simple and devoid of circumstance or of the least attempt at studied eloquence or theatrical effect. He taught mainly by the bedside. His alert eye missed little. His few, kindly, often droll words gained the early confidence of the patient, and kept the student on his tiptoes. His talks in the wards were replete with epigrams. The right adjective, often quaint and unusual, was always on the tip of his tongue, and to a rare degree he possessed the power to inspire in the patient confidence, courage, and hope; in the student, enthusiasm.

The equanimity that he preached he likewise exemplified. "Let not the *Crooked Things* that *can't be made streight* encumber you," said Cotton Mather.* Few followed this wise maxim as did Osler. Of the hopeless and irritating dilemma he always saw the humorous aspect and 'twas dismissed in the twinkling of an eye, with the one word that might almost—indeed sometimes did—accomplish the seemingly impossible. These "Oslerisms," as his disciples called them, were a delight to his pupils. Indeed, at one time two had almost published a collection.

Plus je songe à la vie humaine, plus je crois qu'il faut lui donner pour témoins et pour juges l'Ironie et la Pitié, comme les Égyptiens appelaient sur leurs morts la déesse Isis et la déesse Nephtys. L'Ironie et la Pitié sont deux bonnes conseillières; l'une, en souriant, nous rend la vie aimable; l'autre, qui pleure, nous la rend sacrée. L'Ironie que j'invoque n'est point cruelle. Elle ne raille pas ni l'amour ni la beauté. Elle est douce et bienveillante. Son rire calme la colère, et c'est elle qui nous enseigne à nous moquer des méchants et des sots, que nous pouvions, sans elle, avoir la faiblesse de haïr.†

This gentle *"Ironie,"* for which we have no word in English, this gentle *"Ironie"* which neither wounds nor embitters—how well he understood it! In nearly thirty years of friendship, in fifteen years of daily association with Osler,

*Manuductio ad ministerium, etc. 12°. Boston, Hancock, 1726, p. 147.
†Anatole France: Le Jardin d'Epicure, p. 121.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I never heard from his lips an unkind word about a brother practitioner. He saw and he appealed to the best in every man. More than this, no one could speak ill of his neighbor in his presence. He who forgot himself once never did so again. One evening among the group of students who gathered about his table on Saturdays, an old college mate began to ridicule a colleague. In a moment Osler turned, and pointing to the photograph over his fireplace, said: "Do you not think that Innsbrück statue of King Arthur a fine figure?" The colleague flushed, the students shivered, the subject changed. And it was ever so.

He loved his fellow men and they loved him. His table was always filled with passing guests: colleagues from a distant point, the country doctor, the student who, coming to visit the clinic, was stunned to find himself carried away to luncheon with the great man that he had expected only to listen to from afar. "The master word in medicine," he said in one of his most beautiful addresses, "is work." But efficient work, he says in another, means inevitably system. He knew not idleness, and he put into his life and maintained in a manner which can only be described as masterful, a remarkable system.

At seven he rose; breakfast before eight. At a few minutes before nine he entered the hospital door. After a morning greeting to the superintendent, humming gaily, with arm passed through that of his assistant, he started with brisk, springing step down the corridor towards the wards. The other arm, if not waving gay or humorous greetings to nurses or students as they passed, was thrown around the neck or passed through the arm of another colleague or assistant, and by the time the ward was reached, the little group had generally grown like a small avalanche.

The visit over, to the private ward. For the many convalescents, or the nervous invalid whose mind needed diversion from self, some lively, droll greeting or absurd remark or preposterous and puzzling invention, and away to the next in an explosion of merriment, often amid the laughing but vain appeals of the patient for an opportunity to retaliate. For those who were gravely ill, few words, but a charming and reassuring manner. Then, running the gauntlet of a group of friends or colleagues or students or assistants, all with problems to discuss, he escaped. How? Heaven only knows!

A cold luncheon, always ready, shortly after one. Twenty minutes rest in his room; then his afternoon hours. At half past four, in the parlor opposite his consulting room, the clans began to gather, graciously received by dear "Mrs. Chief," as Lady Osler was affectionately known. Soon the "Chief" entered with a familiar greeting for all. It was an anxious moment for those who had been waiting long for the word that they had been seeking with him. After five or ten minutes he would rise, and perhaps beckon to the lucky man to follow him to his study. More often he slipped quietly from the room and in a minute reappeared at the door in his overcoat, hat in hand. A gay wave of the hand, "Goodby," and he was off to his consultations.

Dinner at seven, to which, impartially and often, his assistants were invited. In the evening he did no set work, and retired early to his study where, his wife by the fire, he signed letters and cleared up the affairs of the day. Between ten and eleven o'clock, to bed. Such were his days. Three mornings in the week he took at home for study. He utilized every minute of his time. Much of his summer vacation went to his studies. On railway, in cab, on his way to and from consultations, in tramway, and in the old "bob-tailed" car that used to carry us to the hospital, book and pencil were ever in his hand, and wherever he was, the happy thought was caught on the wing and noted down. His ability at a glance to grasp and to remember the gist of the article that he read was extraordinary.

His power to hold the mastery of his time was remarkable. He escaped as by magic, but so graciously, so engagingly that, despair though one might, he could hardly be irritated. No one could speak consecutively to Osler against his will. How did he do it? I know not.

His humor was irrepressible. It cropped out in everything. Now it was in medical articles, published under an amusing pseudonym, which were excruciatingly funny—reports of amazing cases, subjects which could lead no man astray, but have been seriously and solemnly quoted. Now it was a sly thrust at a colleague in the absurd title of a medical paper which mysteriously found its way into the program of a society meeting. Now it was the elaborately prepared counterfeit of a new journal, presented at a dinner, with a whole table of contents which brought horror to the hearts of the victims—and the rest a blank. His assistants had always to be on their guard. The genial practical jokes played on his friends were endless, and so notorious that, alas, they have grown sadly with repetition. In a tight place he would pass under his *nom de plume*, unknown to the puzzled bore who had sought to nail him down. His generosity to his assistants was unending, and almost every gift, every act of kindness was accompanied by some droll and often really humorous mystification.

Wherever Osler went the charm of his personality brought men together; for the good in all men he saw, and as friends of Osler all men met in peace. Under his inspiration the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland took on a new life, and a new harmony reigned among all about him.

Throughout all his life Osler was a student of the lives of those who had gone before. Biography was to him of compelling interest, and in his numerous biographical essays, some of which have been collected in "An Alabama Student," he stimulated in his students a reverence for the great names of medicine, and an interest, sometimes as deep as his own, in the search for the recondite in the history of our art.

But above all this Osler was a scholar. In early life he had given little time to the classics. But few men have lived more completely in the atmosphere of the great minds of the past. An insatiate reader, his memory was remarkable, and the timely and happy quotation was always on his lips. Nightly, for half an hour, he communed with that which was best in literature. He loved books, and early laid the foundations of the great collection which was his at the time of his death—a collection, at the outset, of the first editions and early publications of the masters of medicine and later of like treasures in all branches of science and the humanities. At the time of his death he had accomplished the impossible—Osler, doctor of medicine and practitioner of his art, was president of the British Classical Association.

His occasional addresses, collected in part in "Æquanimitas and Other Addresses," were the mirror of his own ideals and his own character. Written in an engaging and forceful style, they contain much that is beautiful. But that which is more beautiful and more impressive than

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the words is the thought that Osler lived and practiced to the letter the precepts that he preached. He rarely spoke of himself, but at the great farewell dinner in New York he talked briefly and touchingly of his ideals. These ideals he realized.

Some have criticized Osler for his reluctance to enter into combat against that of which, in his heart, he disapproved; some were inclined to regard him as one who shunned disagreeable complications rather than facing them. Osler did hate and shun useless strife, but when the time came—and he was a very wise judge of the proper moment—no one was more fearless or more outspoken than he, as more than one of his colleagues may remember. When the word must be spoken, he was ready to speak it regardless of what it might mean for himself.

His home life could scarcely have been more beautiful, and Lady Osler was no less dear than he to the immense circle that came to call them their friends. In Britain as in America, Osler's charm and brilliancy, his learning and his skill brought him the same universal affection and respect. He was made a baronet, a deserved honor. His house at Oxford became the Mecca of Americans. His hospitality knew no bounds. Sometimes forty or fifty guests would gather for afternoon tea.

There was but one child, Edward Revere Osler, a lad of but ten when they left America. In this boy Osler's life was centred. Always attractive and fond of outdoor life, he developed into a singularly charming character, with an interest in and an understanding of that which is beautiful in art and literature rare in one of his age. He began to collect books and to collect them intelligently. To his father this development was an inexpressible joy.

Surrounded by honors and love abroad, and with perfect happiness at home, a figure of growing significance among his colleagues of the old university, active in his profession and in the gathering and cataloguing of his wonderful library, the sky was clear—and the war came.

Whole-heartedly and without a bitter word, he gave himself as ever to the duties of the hour. In the medical department of the army his advice was sought on all manner of questions. He was consultant to a number of hospitals and in our hours of hesitation and delay he was active in stimulating his old students to come to the aid of those who were fighting our battles. Lady Osler was no less active than he. The boy first worked at a hospital in France, then entered the Training Corps, joined the artillery, and left for the front. It was a strange picture, this man who all his life had been the apostle of "Unity, Peace and Concord" ("Æquanimitas and Other Addresses," p. 447) flung suddenly with all that was nearest and dearest into the vortex of war. True to his own precepts he consumed his own smoke; there was never a lament or a complaint. But in his letters to those near to him the ever present anxiety for his boy was manifested by the inevitable reference made in brave, cheerful words to the sword that hung over their heads.

In August, 1917, cruelly wounded, Revere died, cared for, mercifully, by dear friends who chanced to be at his side. The blow Osler bore with calm dignity and beauty. The old life continued; his house, as ever, was open to all. In the last year of his life over sixteen hundred guests sat at his hospitable board. But it was a crushing blow from which he never recovered, and it killed that exuberant vitality which had promised so many long and fertile years. Yet with the same old cordiality he greeted his friends, with the same outward air of enthusiasm he went about his many activities. His address as president of the Classical Association was a contribution in which those who strive for the maintenance of high standards of scholarship in medicine will long take comfort.

The twelfth of July was his seventieth birthday. Two volumes of contributions to the medical sciences prepared in his honor by pupils and friends were presented to him by his colleague Sir Clifford Allbutt. His old students and companions in Baltimore united in dedicating their affectionate tributes to the beloved master. Testimonials of gratitude and affection poured in upon him from all sides. On few in their lifetime has such honor and love been showered. He was deeply moved. But his heart was broken. And when the test came, the old bodily vigor and resistance were gone.

In his last days he remembered as ever his associates of former years. Week by week he dictated or wrote letters from his sickbed first to one and then to another of his old friends. And when he could no longer write he asked those by him to write in his stead.

He was a keen observer, a brilliant clinician. His contributions to medicine and medical education were important. He was a great teacher. But his main strength lay in the singular and unique charm of his presence, in the sparkling brilliancy of his mind, in the rare beauty of his character and of his life, and in the example that he set to his fellows and to his students. He was a quickening spirit.

At the meeting following his death, the Medical and Chirurgical Faculty of Maryland adopted this minute:

Died
on 29 December, 1919, at Oxford,
WILLIAM OSLER, Baronet.
Physician, teacher, guide, lover of his fellow man.

Noble exemplar of charity and tolerance and temperance and work and love;

Untiring stimulator and generous benefactor of this Society;

Whose sparkling wit and genial, subtle humor smoothed the rough way of life for so many weary spirits;

Whose presence banished discord and suspicion.

The gap which his absence leaves among us will forever be warmed by the glow of that all-embracing love which radiated from his presence like a halo of light, and brought to all about him something of the peace that now is his.

Contributors to This Issue

"AN UNASSIMILATED FOREIGNER" is a successful manufacturer in a western city, who has had wide experience and observation of American life.

MALCOLM SPARKES, one of the outstanding figures in the British building trade, is the author of the remarkable plan of organization now successfully in operation in that industry.

WILLIAM S. THAYER, successor to Dr. Osler as professor of clinical medicine in Johns Hopkins University and physician-in-chief to the Johns Hopkins Hospital, is a leader in American medicine and medical education.

GEORGE F. WHICHER is associate professor of English in Amherst College, and a frequent contributor to the leading reviews.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Correspondence

National Problems in Local Settings*

Warsaw, October 14

THE route from Vienna to Warsaw by way of Cracow took me through Nikolsburg, Brunn, and Teschen. I had been warned by an American acquaintance at Vienna that I would not find the Czechs an agreeable people to deal with, and that it would be well to have passports and permits in order and to be prepared for delays. As a matter of fact, neither in crossing the frontier from Austria into Czecho-Slovakia, nor in entering or leaving Teschen, did we meet with anything but courtesy from either Czech or Polish authorities. Nowhere, however, was there any love for the Germans, nor did the German inhabitants of Czecho-Slovakia on their part appear to accept Czech rule as anything better than a dire necessity. At Nikolsburg, a German-speaking town just across the Austrian border in Czecho-Slovakia, the feeling between the races was such that Germans and Czechs would not sit at the same table in the hotel; while at Brunn, a busy manufacturing city two-thirds of whose population are Germans, Czechs and Germans patronize different restaurants and attend the theatres on different days of the week, the two sets of theatre performances having each its separate staff and separate orchestra. Thanks to the influence of a number of French officers who are employed in training Czecho-Slovak troops, wanton attacks upon German residents of the city and the destruction of German signs and monuments had been stopped; but the officers themselves were still disliked, not because they had insisted upon ending disorder, but because they read German newspapers and attended German plays.

I have already commented upon the fact that agriculture, even in stricken Austria, appeared to be in a healthy state notwithstanding the poverty and industrial prostration of the cities. In the part of Czecho-Slovakia which I traversed both industry and agriculture were obviously prosperous. Brunn, with more than thirty textile establishments and a considerable number of Czech workingmen, was operating all the factories that the limited coal supply would admit; as a consequence, the market for agricultural produce was reported to be good. Beyond Brunn, the great landed estates which are a characteristic feature of Czecho-Slovakia and Poland showed high cultivation, with a few tractors and many fine draught horses to aid in the work. The crowded peasant villages, too, with their thatched log-houses and small garden allotments, were far superior in cleanliness and stolid orderliness to the wretched Polish communities between Cracow and Warsaw. In Czecho-Slovakia as in Poland, however, one hears that the great estates are being broken up, that peasant proprietorship is increasing, and that the price of land is rising steadily.

If the Czecho-Slovaks cherish any dislike for foreigners, and especially for English and Americans, they certainly were successful in concealing it so far as my contact with them went. The Poles, on the contrary, always excepting the official and cultivated classes, the army, and the Jews, both cherish dislike and show it. It was impossible to get decent service or attention at a hotel or restaurant at Cracow, and the rudeness of shopkeepers and persons of whom one ventured to ask a question on the street was surprising. Perhaps the fact that German is the only language except Polish that is generally understood, and that the feeling of enmity toward Germany is even stronger in Poland than in Czecho-Slovakia, may afford an explanation; but the atmosphere, whatever its source, was certainly unpleasant. Yet it must be remembered that Czecho-Slovakia and Poland, whatever their particular attitude toward the Allied Governments may be, are still practically on a military basis. There are soldiers everywhere. It is an officer in uniform, supported by a guard with rifles in hand, who examines your passport and asks what you have in your luggage. It is an officer who gives you gasoline, or who courteously takes a place in your automobile and pilots you out of town. There are military police in almost every city or village, and you cannot as a rule enter a post office or a public building without being eyed by a soldier. It is not in such an atmosphere that good manners are cultivated or that racial enmities die out.

On the other hand, it was hard to discover, either in the smaller towns or in the larger industrial centres, any special interest in politics. Politicians and office-holders there were, of course, everywhere, reflecting the opinions of the capital in their talk, and retailing a certain amount of personal gossip which it was expected would pass for news; but of the larger issues which the capitals discussed, and still more of the weighty and complicated international questions with which the air of Paris is charged, one heard but little. Political opinion, where anything properly to be so called was discernible, was chiefly personal or local. The prices of food and fuel and the possibility of getting enough of either, the state and prospect of the crops, the shortage of milk, butter, and fresh meat, and the burden of taxes bulked far greater in the thoughts of the local functionary or banker or merchant or inkeeper than did the operations of government at Prague or Warsaw or the backing and filling of the Supreme Council. Expressions of sympathy for Austria were not uncommon, and I thought that I detected a degree of interest in Hungary which seemed to indicate a political *rapprochement* in the not distant future. Of the general "war weariness," however, which characterized Austria and Southern Germany I saw little in either town or country.

I must leave my impressions of Poland for a later letter. I approached Warsaw, however, with a favorable prepossession. A few kilometres outside of the city our automobile broke down. Two of the party, thanks to the courtesy of a passing Pole, presently went on; I remained behind to help with the repairs. It was already dark, and a cold, raw wind blew strongly across the open plain; presently the moon disappeared, and only the stars were left for light. Hour after hour we worked at tires which the rough roadbed had nearly wrecked, and which, patch and pump them as we might, long refused to stand. But we did not work alone. A few rods away, opposite where we stood, a man and a woman were building a little house—raising the last timbers of the roof, nailing on the covering boards, and closing in the sides. They had no lantern, and we did not hear them talk; midnight passed, and they still worked on. It was after two o'clock when, with our repairs completed, we started for Warsaw; but the man and the woman still plied the hammer and the saw, and the humble home was growing under their hands. I could not but wonder, as we drove away, whether industry and devotion of such a sort were characteristic of the Polish peasants and of the men and women who, with them, are building the new Polish state.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

*The third of a series of letters describing conditions in Central Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ruminations

By OSCAR C. WILLIAMS

"SO," I said, "I am feeling
What I shall always feel—
The sharp toe of a stone,
And a shadow's heel."

"So," I said, "I am seeing
What I shall always see—
The snow blossoms of moonlight
Blowing on a tree."

"So," I said, "I am hearing
What I shall always hear—
The winds with hair of starlight
Crying wild and clear."

"So," I said, "I glory in
What shall always be mine—
The flowers flushing red
In the sky's blue wine."

"So," I said, "I am living
What I may not be—
A dusty masterpiece,
A mouldy biography."

In the Driftway

IN the midst of the coldest winter weather the Drifter can warm himself by remembering an Illinois oats-field on a certain day when the thermometer stood at 110 in any shade there was and would have gone ten or fifteen degrees higher under the rays of the sun. The heavens had been heated from blue to brass; the earth, burnt white and tindery with the long drought, had cracked like a potsherd; waves of heat rose evenly on every side, shimmering with their own intensity. The wind was as if it had never been, and the dust kicked up by heel or wheel settled back without the migration of an inch. In that furnace there was no relief. To sit down in the delusive shadow of a wheat shock was to burn against the bright, hard straw and to feel choked with the heavier but not cooler air next the ground. To move about was to meet no comfortable breeze, for every part of the field was as hot as any other. Under foot the new-cut stubble stabbed shoes and ankles with sharp, hot edges. Water was dull and brackish in every jug. The sun had no mercy for man or beast. Wherever strap or backsaddle or trace or collar touched a horse he lathered almost instantly; the horses on the binder panted in a hundred yards; their nostril would begin to redden if they went three hundred yards without resting. The shockers half envied the person on the binder seat, but they had small reason for doing so. They at least touched only earth and straw. He was involved with a loud machine of painted wood and blistering metal. When his twine snarled or his bundle-carrier failed to trip or a cornstalk wedged on his sickle-guard even his accustomed hand could hardly endure to touch the machinery. Burning reflections flashed into his aching eyes from the reel as it turned round. The swish of the horses' feet through the stubble, the rattle of the sickle, the whisk of the falling grain, the clatter of the slats of the apron, the crunch of the bull-wheel on the dry earth, the rumble and grunt of the tying mechanism, the kick of the carrier as it dropped its load—all these blended in a drone which now rose to thunder, now sank to a roar, but always seemed to clog the atmosphere, already crowded with heat and flying rust. That fiery day entered the very spirit of the driver, who was the Drifter, and who therefore in the coldest weather can warm himself with a mere recollection.

* * * * *

SOME day when the history of the education of the freed Negro is written a high place will be assigned to the men and women of the North who ventured into the unreconstructed South to take up the burden of educating the black millions whom it was a crime to teach to read prior to Appomattox. These missionaries, as "nigger-teachers," went to complete social ostracism, to bitter hostility and often to grave personal risks, giving up all the amenities and all the good things of life. Particularly has this been true of those who took up the higher education of the Negroes below Mason and Dixon's Line. Their tasks called for self-repression, unending patience, limitless self-control. They worked at pitifully small wages and for institutions which often kept them waiting for months for their salaries. They were outwardly usually plain, singularly modest and unpretentious; within them glowed the spirit of the Apostles and of the martyrs. In this whole great group none was animated by a finer spirit of true American patriotism than Horace Bumstead, for thirty-two years professor at or president of Atlanta University, whose death has but lately been recorded. A major of colored troops before Petersburg in 1864, when but a lad out of Yale, he took up his cross and bore it bravely for that long period. Of a most delicate and sensitive nature, he faced uncomplainingly the double burden of the headship of the college and of raising almost every dollar by that most trying of all tasks—personal begging from door to door. No one can ever compel himself to that who has not given his soul to his cause. Horace Bumstead gave everything he had.

* * * * *

FILLING out the census blank was a distinct disappointment to the Drifter. After answering the draft questionnaire and making income tax returns, he was keyed up for something big and complex, and had decided to set aside an evening to remain at home and work on the document. When the blank appeared it was so absurdly simple that the Drifter put off answering it for a week. It is no intellectual problem to state whether one is deaf and dumb, nor is there the least mental stimulus in giving one's age in completed years at last birthday, though there is the story of the woman who answered the query if she was married or single by writing "Unmarried; twice." Even filling out information for a passport is more thrilling than answering the questions of the census-taker, and the Drifter is reminded how during the war an Englishman wrote to *The Times* complaining that, after he had described his face as "intelligent," a stupid clerk changed it to "oval." Decidedly, the census queries are disappointing in their simplicity and meagreness. They prompt the Drifter to ask one question in return of the Director of the Census: "Where do you get the material for that shelf of mammoth volumes that you undoubtedly plan to publish early in 1929?"

THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Ireland's Irreconcilables

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Does Mr. Boyd (in his article on Reconcilable Ireland, in *The Nation* of December 13) suppose that England's real objection is to the name "Republic" for Ireland? We Irish are fully aware that the same considerations which make an Irish republic objectionable to England are found *in toto* in the Dominion plan, and that the chances of either for the approval of the British Government are practically nil. But we also know that the consensus of public opinion, even in England among men of finer conscience, is strongly supporting our demand for unequivocal self-determination—self-determination in fact and in name. We believe the pressure of sentiment to be so powerful as to eliminate the probability of an appeal to force by either disputant. With all respect for the sincerity of the reconcilables, we point out that the American, French, and Russian republics were founded by irreconcilables, and that the consequences of irreconcilability would seem to be at least as practical and enduring as those of that reconcilability of expedient and surrendered principle which has prevailed in the past, and whose handiwork we see crumbling around us.

But if Ireland's seventy-five per cent. of irreconcilables were to face extermination tomorrow, I, an Irish Protestant, know that throughout all creeds and conditions of the Irish people there exists a certain temperamental abandonment to idealism which, to the Celt, makes annihilation infinitely preferable to vassalage, be it of fact or of spirit.

Chicago, January 14 AMY DYCEFORTH

The Pugnacious Root

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I am following with great interest the industrial movements in the United States and have just read your article on The Quest of Industrial Peace.

The comment I feel inclined to make is that experience proves all hopes of finding peace in any "system" illusory. These conflicts occur under every system, where there is no question of profit at all. They occur in State and municipal services, not carried on for profit, in coöperative societies, in trade unions and in soviets. I have not made any exact computation, but looking to the immense preponderance of privately owned concerns, I doubt if strikes and disputes are not proportionately at least as frequent in those in which there is no question of profit as in those in which profit is supposed to be the chief or sole motive.

The root lies much deeper. The division of spoils is an occasion of quarrelling, but only one, and the occasion is not the cause. Men can always find an occasion. The root lies in man's insatiable pugnacity, his ineradicable self-assertiveness and desire for mastery, which is a fundamental and distinctive attribute of human nature. Reason struggles with it but is generally beaten.

The industrial conflict is not between labor and capital, but between men who are in the relation of employers and employed, director and directed. And this relation exists under any and every system. In the army, navy, and merchant service it is called mutiny and suppressed by force; in industrial life it is called a strike. Why should we assume that any change in the system of business ownership and management will put an end to this conflict?

I wish some one would explain exactly what is meant by "production for use not profit." What change, for instance, would its adoption involve in the conduct of a boot factory or a steel works?

Richmond, England, December 11 A. SHADWELL

The Man With the Yellow Streak

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: *The Nation, The New Republic, The Dial,* and other keen, high-minded, and forward-looking journals of American opinion have from the beginning repudiated the covenant of peace. Here and there a distinguished citizen like Amos Pinchot has repudiated it. Nine members of the American peace delegation have repudiated it. In England writers like Wells and scholars like Gilbert Murray have repudiated it. And day by day new voices of repudiation come from the soul of France, and from the neutral nations too. The world's labor has repudiated it of course. But where in America is the teacher or preacher, among all those lately so eloquent of national morality, that has come out, as a free man with political vision in this ethical crisis of our country?

Two years ago the outcry swept the land that our honor was at stake. Where now are those who cried loudest then? Our honor is again at stake; not now threatened from without (if indeed honor is ever threatened from without), but already imperilled, if not already undermined from within. America's word, pledged not alone to America's foe but to the whole world, pledged not alone to her own manhood but to her own future generations, is made veritably a hissing and a by-word. I shudder at the warfare waged till yesterday, even on the field of the grounded arms, against the new socialist republics of Central Europe, and at the warfare still being waged, without sanction of cause or decree, against the new socialist republic of Eastern Europe—by those who have waged war to establish government by the consent of the governed. I shudder at this devil's own blockade, this starvation of women and children in these new lands by those who took up arms in the name of humanity against the murderers of children and the ravishers of women. I shudder at the triumphant shouting of good people everywhere whom our physical victory has so blinded to our spiritual defeat that they have accepted the stale charlatanry of this plausible document of Big Business for the New Dispensation.

But who am I that I should shudder? I am not he, that most tragic of all mankind—the disillusioned pro-war American liberal. What right have I to prate of America? I questioned our entry into the war; troubled by Allied imperialism long before Lenin published the secret treaties that Wilson didn't know about; persuaded of some saving remnants of right-mindedness in the German people long before Wilson assured the German people of his unwavering confidence and affection; convinced we should exact in advance some guarantees from the Allies beside a few well-staged tears at the tomb of George Washington; appalled before the possibility of a futile sacrifice of American life and a débâcle of American intelligence; and finally reconciled to our part in the war only by an act of all too imperfect faith that our embattled idealists might mean what they said and might somehow make good. I am the Man with the Yellow Streak to the end of my days, even though no patriot in Christendom has had, since he arrived at political maturity, less use for Potsdam, or the Kaiser, or the Kaiser's son, as an instrument of government, than I have, except, perhaps, Debs whom they jailed and Jaurès whom they slew. What right have I—and the several millions like me—to prate of America? Are we not self-confessed pro-Germans, Shadow-Huns, traitors—not at this moment in some Federal prison only by the grace of the god of our obedience, the Great God Mum? A fellow townsman, originally from beyond our national borders, and quite pardonably puffed up by a brand-new set of naturalization papers, told me over two years ago: "The only way you can serve our country is to keep your mouth shut." And this is the first time, I think, that I have completely forgotten his admonition. Perhaps I should not have forgotten.

West of Chicago, January 1 ROBERT WYLIE WELDON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

German Property and Allied Honor

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: There is one phase of the treaty with Germany which has received little public consideration—namely, that which deals with debts, property, rights, and interests under sections III and IV of Part X of the treaty. Section III of Part X provides for clearing offices for the payment of commercial debts, bills of exchange, and similar claims. The total amount due to German nationals is to be collected, and payment is to be made from this sum of debts owing by Germans to United States nationals. The balance due in favor of Germany is to be retained until complete payment has been effected of the sums due to the United States or its nationals on account of the war.

Section IV provides that the Allied and Associated Powers reserve the right to retain and liquidate all property, rights, and interests belonging at the date of the coming into force of the treaty to German nationals within the Allied territories. This means that the United States and Canada have the right, if they so desire, to liquidate and take over all German property within their respective territories. The amount realized from the proceeds of this property is to be retained, in the first place, to pay debts owing by Germans with respect to Allied property, rights, and interests in Germany; claims growing out of acts committed by the German Government after the 31st of July, 1914, and before these countries entered into the war; and for debts owing by Germans in so far as they have not otherwise been satisfied. The balance is to be credited to Germany under the provisions of Article 243 for reparation.

There is one pertinent clause of the treaty which should receive due consideration—namely, paragraph (i) of Article 297, Section IV of Part X as follows: "Germany undertakes to compensate her nationals in respect of the sale or retention of their property rights, or interests in Allied or Associated states." In a word, the Allies, including the United States and Canada, may retain all German property that they can avail themselves of, and the owners must look to the German Government for compensation.

Whether there were good grounds for thinking at the time the treaty was drawn that the German Government could adequately compensate its nationals for property taken by the Allies, there is no doubt at the present time that these terms of the treaty bring about a confiscation of German property. It is unnecessary to go into a discussion of this subject from the standpoint of the international lawyer; it is discussed in all the leading books on international law. They are in accord on the subject. We have the right to confiscate German property. In times which we look back upon as barbarous, that right was exacted, but it has not been exacted in modern times. I shall make only two quotations, the first from a memorandum from Alexander Hamilton to President Washington on Articles VI and X of the Jay Treaty. These articles provided for the settlement of existing debts and claims, and also that in the event of future wars between the United States and the United Kingdom private property should be inviolable.

Referring to Article VI (Lodge edition, volume V, page 144): "The article of the former treaty on this head was, as I conceive, nothing more than the formal sanction of a doctrine which makes part of the modern law or usage of nations. The confiscation of private debts in time of war is reprobated by the most approved writers on the laws of nations, and by the negative practice of civilized nations, during the present century. The free recovery of them, therefore, on the return of peace, was a matter of course, and ought not to have been impeded, had there been no article."

Again on page 160: "Article X.—In my opinion this article is nothing more than an affirmance of the modern law and usage of civilized nations, and is valuable as a check upon a measure which, if it could ever take place, would disgrace the government of the country, and injure its true interests. The general proposition of writers on the laws of nations is, that all enemy's property, wherever found, is liable to seizure and confiscation; but reason pronounces that this is with the exception of all such property as exists in the faith of the laws of your own country; such are the several kinds of property which are protected by this article. And though in remote periods the exception may not have been duly observed, yet the spirit of commerce, diffusing more just ideas, has been giving strength to it for a century past, and a negative usage among nations, according with the opinions of modern writers, authorizes the considering the exception as established. If there have been deviations from that usage in the actual war of Europe, they form no just objection to this reasoning; for this war has violated, in different instances, most of the most sacred laws of nations. It is said that the power which is given up by this article was the only effective check upon Great Britain. I answer:

"1st. That there existed before no rightful or moral power; and, notwithstanding the treaty, there will still exist a power without right or morality. The treaty only adds the sanction of an express, to what was before an implied, pledge of the public faith. The one may be still violated as well as the other; and the only use of the article will be to give prudent and good men an additional argument against an act of national iniquity.

"2d. That the fear of the exercise of this power has not hitherto appeared to be a check upon Great Britain; and the menace of its exercise can never take place without doing ourselves more harm than good, by tarnishing our honor and shaking our credit.

"3d. That war itself acts as a virtual sequestration of property, by interrupting the course of remittances; and the Government by interfering does little more than render itself liable for the dilapidations of vicious individuals who take advantage of the circumstances; since treaties of peace, unless one party is totally prostrate, will never fail to reinstate private debts."

The second quotation is from a modern French writer on international law, Alphonse Rivier, page 232: "On ne confisque plus, de nos jours, les biens des sujets de l'État ennemi, situés ou trouvés dans le territoire, ni les créances de cet État ou de ses sujets contre des nationaux. Le belligérant qui prendrait de telles mesures, provoquerait sur le champ des mesures de rétorsion ou de représailles qui seraient désastreuses pour lui. Le respect de la propriété privée, durant la guerre, est un principe acquis à l'exception, toutefois, de celle qui flotte sur mer."

This is the pith of the subject. The nation holding private property of nationals of the defeated belligerent is not restrained by any just motive, or by any thought of sympathy. It is restrained by its own interests. This principle of international law was unquestionably not of sudden growth. It arose from the experience of European warring nations. Its primary motive may be that of self-interest, but it is based on justice.

It is idle to assert that under Article 297 (i) of the treaty we are justified in the exaction, that we may take German property which was acquired in our country under the protection of our laws and have the German property owner look to his government. If the German property is credited to the German Government for reparation, have we any assurance that that Government will recompense the owner? At present there is great doubt that he will be recompensed. If we could hope that the League of Nations could end war, or if we could believe that we have no future need of foreign trade, we might let the question pass. The Allies are all parties to the treaty, and it should be noted that this section of the treaty is optional. But even if it is acted upon by all, will the banker or the merchant of the exacting Powers, as well as of Germany, look upon the taking of German property with indifference? What is being done with German property may well be done in the future with theirs. Irrespective of any question of justice and fair dealing, we should consider the future of our foreign trade.

Montreal, January 7 Canadian

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

Cross-Sections

Carven from the Laurel Tree. By Theodore Maynard. Robert M. McBride and Company.
John Stuyvesant Ancestor. By Alvin Johnson. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.
Books and Things. By Philip Littell. Harcourt, Brace and Howe.
Books in General. By Solomon Eagle. Alfred A. Knopf.
Literature with a Large L. By MacGregor Jenkins. Houghton Mifflin Company.
Prejudices. By H. L. Mencken. Alfred A. Knopf.

A PILGRIMAGE through half a dozen volumes of recent essays affords as interesting sidelights on tendencies and attitudes of mind characteristic of the times as Chaucer found in the conversation of his nine and twenty companions. For the essay best expresses the small talk of an age of reason. Invented by two men of distinctively modern type, Montaigne the psychologist and Bacon the scientist, the essay has continued to reflect the dominant impulses of the period they inaugurated—the desire to explore unknown corners of the brain, and the will to make of the intellect an all-efficient tool. These impulses the essay shows as practices incompletely realized, as aspirations struggling with human fallibility. If there is any significance in the gossip of recent essayists, it would seem as though human fallibility were having the best of the struggle, as though "sweet reasonableness" were losing its charms with age, and the house-cleaning of the brain were raising a fine thick cloud of dust.

In "Carven from the Laurel Tree," for example, Mr. Theodore Maynard would show us how the ground of reason is crumbling beneath our feet. But it is not into some unknown gulf of the future that he would have us slide. Rather he reassures us that the perils of a forward plunge may be avoided if we will but let ourselves down a gentle backward declivity into the arms of the old Faith. His title, drawn from the couplet,

> How the crucifix may be
> Carven from the laurel tree,

implies that genuine poetic expression is but an outpouring of Catholic piety. It is in the art of Alice Meynell and Francis Thompson that he finds inspiration. His essays on Sanctity and the Sanitary Inspector and on The Guild Idea suggest that all phases of human endeavor will be futile until founded on the same sure basis. Readers who cannot agree with the Catholic bias which he readily confesses, may nevertheless delight in his repudiation of mysticism as an æsthetic exercise, laugh with him at the humor of the saints, and enjoy meeting in his pages a cloistered spirit who knows no perplexities.

Such poise as Mr. Maynard's is needful when we open "John Stuyvesant Ancestor" and survey the world of perplexities into which Mr. Alvin Johnson introduces us. His book of people is a book of cases keenly observed in the sociological clinic: the brilliant girl marooned at an Arizona water-tank by marriage to an ineffectual man; the mother whose life is empty after her children have grown up; the inventor kept from being a benefit to society by high financiers; the bachelor experiencing the illusions of his grand climacteric; the alumnus of an up-to-date jail seeking to improve a backward community by propagating ideals learned in the penitentiary; the futile revolt of farmers against a village "ring"; the Victorian liberal betrayed into a moment of illiberal malice. All are warped, twisted, bewildered, impotent in their several stations. The picture of their wintry discontents, however, is redeemed for the reader by Mr. Johnson's grim but pungent irony, by his faithful delineation of sharp outlines, and by his freedom from preconceptions. He is a professor of sociology skeptical even of his own laboratory methods and quick to show us, as in his title story, the futility of amateurish applications of social psychology. There is a saving twinkle in the professor's eyes. He may choose to regard men and women as cases, but he is not himself one.

Belief in the desirability of a free mind is also the creed of another editor of *The New Republic*, Mr. Philip Littell. With something of the irresponsibility of Montaigne and the disillusionment of Anatole France, he is yet in full cry on the trail of realities. His dread of the insincere and the sentimental makes him amusingly distrustful of high motives, and a little wistful in the presence of "those spiritual moods to which nowadays we do not rise by accident, nor yet by will, nor at all without the help of strong hands." If in speaking of men and women he is apt to dilate their failings of pomposity, affectation, and absurdity for the sheer pleasure of pricking the bubbles he has blown, when he talks of books he is alert, penetrating, unprejudiced. His sense of realities keeps a perfect balance wherever, as in literary criticism, it can work with all the evidence before it. Nor does it yield only negative results. It makes him aware of limitations of vision in the doctrinaire Shaw, of a certain fatiguing sameness in Swinburne's celebrations of sin. But it also guards him from a shallow depreciation of Tennyson and Browning. He is ready to shake hands with both, if only the former will confine his conversation to the landscape and the latter will not insist on passing the Pippa with too God-almighty, world-alrighty an air. Fear of insincerity and banality, moreover, leads to positive virtues of style. Mr. Littell's integrity and freshness of language are evident on every page. His reputation might safely rest on a single sentence like his characterization of "In the Cage": "Reading it was like watching Henry James watching through a knothole somebody who was watching somebody else through a knot-hole." If Mr. Littell has caught from abroad a trick of letting the eyelids look a little weary, as though overweighted by too heavy a burden of human experience, he has not yet lost his broad American grin. The grin is the more contagious.

The difference between Mr. Littell's essays and the *causeries* of Solomon Eagle (J. C. Squire) of *The New Statesman* is similar to that between Queen Victoria and the Empress Eugénie in seating themselves. The latter simply sank backward into the chair; Queen Victoria always looked behind first. That nervous dread of flatness which both keys up Mr. Littell's style and gives his writings the air of brilliant set pieces, is notably absent from the pages of Solomon Eagle. His tone is that of easy intimacy, his pace not too fast for delightful companionship. His personality is illuminating but not dazzling, whimsical in tastes, erudite in odd information, fond of hoaxes, given to breaking spontaneously into light verse. His titles may serve to indicate the flavor of his remarks: Was Cromwell an Alligator? The Muse in Liquor, Shakespeare's Women and Mr. George Moore, The Bible as Raw Material, The Beauties of Badness, Wordsworth's Personal Dullness. These headings, however, are merely excuses for desultory chat on any subjects that come to mind. Though mainly occupied with books, the talk frequently reverts to gossip about people. Here, for instance, is a little vignette of a fellow-passenger on a continental train, a German lady with a canary: "At frequent intervals his mistress lifted the green curtain, looked him in the eyes with a bewitching smile, and piped 'Peep, Peep.' The bird never replied, though perhaps he looked his response. The lady then turned to me and said, 'Is 'e not a nice bird? Is 'e not goot?' and common politeness—leaving gallantry out of the question—compelled me to reply always, 'Yes, a beautiful little bird.' About twice an hour she retired to the dining-car and came back exuding smiles and sighs. 'I haf joost 'ad a bifsteck. I dawn't like steck.' How true it is that in life we have to be content with second bests!" Only the sure-footed essayist can risk a comic banality like the last sentence. "Books in General" is what ideal *causeries* ought to be, the relaxation of a powerful mind.

Recreation in good measure with a modicum of elevating

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thoughts is supplied by Mr. MacGregor Jenkins in "Literature with a Large L." The title essay is a plea for a closer human companionship with books; the accompanying paper called Fellow Travellers urges a similar openness of heart in the contact of one person with others. These are mellow subjects and they are ripely treated. The accents of the after-dinner speaker vibrate behind the cold type. Mr. Jenkins is always prepared to turn aside from his subject for the sake of a witty saying or a good story, and his stock of these commodities, accumulated during a long career as a publisher, would enliven any theme. His book is a reminder of what speaking we used to enjoy after dinner in the days when a certain mellowness was not thought inappropriate or illegal.

If we would end our pilgrimage in good Canterbury style with a sermon, it can be found in Mr. Mencken's "Prejudices." It is not, to be sure, a sermon of the ordinary kind, for one of Mr. Mencken's complexes is a hatred of the "Messianic delusion" among authors. Still he has no objection to assuming the rôle of an æsthetic evangelist or a Billy Sunday of the beautiful, seeking to infuse loveliness into our cruder lives by vociferation. An abnormally developed sensitiveness to style is his qualification for the rôle. On any other matter his opinions may best be covered by a garland of terms from his critical vocabulary, as bosh, tosh, flubdub, rumble-bumble, pishposh, flapdoodle, balderdash, poppycock, slobber. Such, for instance, are his efforts to convince us that America has a "peasantry" and needs an aristocracy. A sense for style, however, distinguishes his judgment of books. It may best be seen in isolation in his comment on Howells, that "industrious and inoffensive man," whose novels as far as content goes he would dismiss as "a long row of uninspired and hollow books, with no more ideas in them than so many volumes of the *Ladies' Home Journal*, and no more deep and contagious feeling than so many reports of autopsies, and no more glow and gusto than so many tables of bond prices." Yet by sheer virtue of style Howells "loosened the tightness of English, and let a blast of Elizabethan air into it." Here, indeed, is a paradoxical separation of matter and form for Croceans to chew upon. In discussing the books of Professor Veblen, Mr. Mencken's analysis of substance and his feeling for style unite in the triumphant conviction that the "Great Thinker" is a "geyser of pishposh," on which theme he introduces some pleasing harmonic variations. Mr. Mencken is the Post-Impressionist of critics. Where such writers as Mr. Alvin Johnson and Solomon Eagle prefer clear line, perspective, depth, he does not shrink from laying on masses of gorgeous color. Is this that "barbaric yawp" which Whitman hailed as the language of the future?

GEORGE F. WHICHER

Labor in the Commonwealth

Labour in the Commonwealth. By G. D. H. Cole. B. W. Huebsch.

IF you had chanced to be in England in those dim and hazy days before the Deluge of 1914 you might have heard vague rumors of a new brand of socialism that was beginning to make some headway. If you had then inquired more particularly concerning it you would probably have been told that you should buy *The New Age* weekly and that would keep you *au courant*. You, being a discerning person, would recognize that you had made a very precious find; for though you might not agree with *The New Age* or quite grasp all at once what it was driving at, you would discover that you were in the counsels of a very live and able company of men. You would become familiar with Orage, S. G. Hobson, Cole, Mellor, and some others, and you would duly appreciate them; but you would hardly have guessed that you were looking on the birth and infancy of a doctrine of economic change and reconstruction which was presently to become the most powerful influence in British economic thought.

But so it has turned out. The National Guild Movement has become a factor of the first importance, not alone in that it has gained the adhesion of people of the calibre of Bertrand Russell and J. A. Hobson, but also in that it has profoundly affected all progressive social thinking in Great Britain. It is impossible to read the memorandum of the British Labor party on "Labour and the Social Order" without realizing that its bias is toward such a social synthesis as that for which the Guildsmen have been looking; and it would be difficult to estimate how much of the impulse toward democratic control in industry which found expression in the Whitley scheme and the Garton Foundation Report is due to the early work of the Guildsmen. Its literature is steadily growing, and it is safe to say that no movement of our time has been more ably served by its advocates than has that of National Guilds.

This rapid progress is, of course, due in great part to the war. But pre-war conditions were favorable to the development of the National Guild idea. On the one hand, the criticism which orthodox socialism invited by reason of its dangerous exaltation of the state, and on the other, the distrust provoked by the syndicalist repudiation of the state left the field open for a social gospel which would avoid both the socialist apotheosis and the syndicalist denial. The strength of the National Guild doctrine lay in that it deposed the state from the paramountcy assigned to it in the socialist philosophy while it retained it for such purposes as it was fitted and needed to discharge. The Guildsmen destroyed the socialist state by accepting the syndicalist doctrine of democratic functional controls while it preserved the state as the organ of the community in its capacity as consumer and user, and in the non-economic aspects of its life. Then the war provided a very formidable stimulus to the Guild movement. The performances of the state as employer completed the process of disqualifying it for the central and omnicompetent position assigned to it in the earlier socialism, while the plain business success of certain experiments in industrial democratic control gave a signal endorsement to the contention of the Guildsmen.

Mr. Cole shares with Mr. S. G. Hobson the main credit for the rapid diffusion and acceptance of the Guild principle. Mr. Hobson is a good economist, but his special distinction is that he is the humanist of the movement, while Mr. Cole has been preëminently its political and economic expositor. Since he wrote "The World of Labour" Mr. Cole has produced a stream of strongly reasoned advocacy of the Guild principle in its political and economic aspects; and his work has steadily improved in quality. In "Labour in the Commonwealth" he gives us a systematic discussion of the whole problem of industry; and while in this volume he says little directly about National Guilds, the whole argument leads directly to the brief concluding exposition of the Guild idea.

As a whole, "Labour in the Commonwealth" is a very good book; and it should be read as an able exposition of the general tendency of progressive economic thought in England. Here Mr. Cole though he speaks in the first person does not speak for himself alone; he is the mouthpiece of an influential and growing school of thought. We could wish that Mr. Cole would confine himself more rigorously to plain and straightforward explanation. His excursions into satire and humor are unfortunate. He is as yet too bitter to be successfully satirical and too vehement a controversialist to be happy as a humorist. Mr. Cole's natural controversial weapons are the club and the broadsword, not the foil and the rapier.

This criticism must not, however, be allowed to detract from our appreciation of the substance of the book. We do not expect the choicest English from Mr. Cole; but he always succeeds in making himself perfectly clear. His exposition marches from point to point in an orderly, logical movement; and whether he convinces you or not, he does lay out his whole mind before you with the most complete precision. "Labour in the Commonwealth" is professedly "a book for the Younger Generation," and as it is a statement of Mr. Cole's entire industrial

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

philosophy, there is much in the volume with which readers of his earlier books are familiar. But the book includes a chapter upon Labour and Education which is of real importance. The tendency of the extreme left of the Labor movement to specialize on a distinctively proletarian culture is subjected to a keen criticism, and a very powerful plea is made for a more comprehensive and discriminating culture than a class particularism can possibly produce. Mr. Cole's discussion of the state in this volume is on the whole better than anything he has previously written on this subject; and a chapter on The Organization of Freedom, in which there is an exposition of the Guild idea from the angle of personal liberty, is an exceedingly fresh and suggestive piece of work. It may be indeed that in the end we shall recognize that Mr. Cole's great contribution to social philosophy has been his persistent and able effort to state an ideal of industrial justice in terms of the fullest personal freedom. Socialism and syndicalism both alike carry in themselves possibilities of great danger to personal self-realization; and though Mr. Cole is primarily an economic theorist, he is at bottom too good a humanist to forget that the be-all and end-all of sound economics is a fuller and freer life for common men and women.

"The Riddle of Albania"

Albania, Past and Present. By Constantine A. Chekrezi. The Macmillan Company.

SPEAKING of the "riddle of Albania" is not equivalent to confessing ignorance of that country. Would not Mr. Chekrezi himself admit that the very survival of his nation, the descendants of pre-Hellenic Pelasgians, a nation isolated linguistically and racially from its neighbors, inhabiting one of the poorest countries of the continent, and one which throughout the ages has served as a battleground for empires and a highway of barbarians—would not the author admit that this survival constitutes one of the riddles of history? The Celts once held the European mainland from the Bay of Biscay to the Danube, from the mouth of the Rhine to Olympia, and where are the Celts today? Goths and Vandals were races much more powerful and more numerous than the Albanians; they have disappeared almost without a trace. But the Albanians are still, after an unbroken history of over three thousand years, the autochthonous masters of their native land. Greek and Macedonian, Roman and Byzantine, Goth and Slav, Venetian and Norman crusader, Greek and Turk have trampled over the people of Shkypetars; they have been temporarily subdued, but never broken, never extinguished. Not they but their conquerors have made, sooner or later, an exit from the scene of history.

Successors of the Pelasgians, the Albanians are the only surviving branch of the long-extinct peoples known to antiquity as Illyrians and Thracians, and cousins of the Macedonians of Philip and Alexander. Racially and linguistically they are members of the Indo-European family, but, as an independent subdivision, as far removed from Greek or Latin and Teuton as from Slav or from Celt. In ancient history their rôle, although not great, was by no means unimportant. The relations between Hellenic religion and culture and its Pelasgian predecessor form a fascinating branch of the study of antiquity. A considerable portion of Alexander the Great's armies was composed of Albanians; Pyrrhus, the famous king of Epirus, was an Albanian ruler. The Roman conquest may have left its mark on the Albanian countryside; it has hardly left any on Albanian nationality. In the middle ages Albania, after a brief episode of Goth invasion, resisted the onrush of Slavs which swallowed up Moesia and Illyricum, Macedonia and Thracia, and penetrated to the very gates of Byzantium and the southern capes of Hellas. As the Northern Albanians were adherents of Western Christianity, they stood, in a sense, as the outposts of Rome on the Byzantine marches. In the crusading centuries Albania was ruled by Norman and French and Sicilian princes and counts. It is noteworthy that this is the only Balkan country where feudalism as a system has taken root, so that today we see imported feudal vestiges side by side with the indigenous clan organization.

The Albanians are also the only Balkan race, if we except the Bosnian Serbs, that saved its aristocracy—or rather, whose aristocracy saved itself and its land holdings by embracing Islam. This was shortly after the death of Scanderbeg, Albania's greatest national hero, the scourge of the Turks, when about one-half of the Albanian people followed their leaders in adopting the Mahometan faith, as Mr. Chekrezi explains, not because its tenets appealed to them, but because they preferred political freedom to their old religion. A considerable part of the nation, however, escaped the alternative by emigrating to Greece, Southern Italy, and Sicily, forming flourishing colonies which have survived to this day.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century Albanians played an important rôle in the struggle for Greek liberty; Byron's admiration for the heroic Suliotes is familiar. With the general awakening of Balkan nationalities the Albanians, squeezed in among their hereditary enemies, Serbs, Bulgars, and Greeks, aimed not at independence, but at autonomy within a regenerated Turkish empire. Hoping to realize their aspirations, they supported the Young Turks—as did the Armenians in the beginning. Both were repaid by the rankest ingratitude.

In exposing the violent and insidious methods of the first Balkan Alliance, aiming at the partition of neutral Albania and the extinction of Albanian nationality, Mr. Chekrezi reveals a hitherto little advertised phase of the Balkan struggle. He points out that Albania's great misfortune consisted in having Austria for friend and protector against the imperialistic designs of Serbia and Greece. He puts the proper valuation on the enterprise of the preposterous William, Prince of Wied, who, as Mr. Brailsford rightly says, lacked not only sympathy and good sense, but even common animal courage.

Today the ancient Albanian nation is torn to pieces. Shkodra (Scutari), the capital in the North, is held by the Serbs; Korcha, in the South, by the Greeks. Nevertheless, the hopes of Albanian nationalists for a better and brighter future have not abated. Probably the majority of them will agree with Mr. H. N. Brailsford, who conceives as the best solution of the Albanian problem the appointment of Italy as mandatory in Albania. Alone among the Powers Italy has shown herself friendly to Albanian aspirations and capable of understanding the needs of country and people; and her interest in checking the undue expansion of Greek and Serb power coincides with that of the Albanians.

Mr. Chekrezi's book is the first contribution of a native writer to the English literature of the Albanian question. The volume makes good reading, and is, on the whole, a fair and reliable performance. .

Toward Irish Unity

Rural Reconstruction in Ireland. By Lionel Smith-Gordon and L. C. Staples. The Yale University Press.

IN the preface to this book, Mr. George W. Russell says: "This volume contains the most complete and accurate history of a movement which has come to be of the highest importance to Ireland. It has in it the promise of a more real unity among Irish people than has ever before seemed possible."

The early chapters of the book deal with the economic and social conditions of the Irish population and give a brief history of Irish land legislation. It was Sir Horace Plunkett who proposed voluntary coöperation, here defined as "organization for common effort on a basis of equality." The first efforts were modelled upon the English pattern. Sir Horace for a time shared the view that coöperation by consumers, through their stores, was the first and only step. Little success attended this effort. In Ireland the rural trader could not easily be displaced.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Because of rural conditions, progress had first to be made by other coöperative undertakings, such as the sale of farm produce, the wholesale purchase of farm supplies, and rural credit. The history of the Irish Agricultural Organization Society has been one of continuous progress in the face of great difficulties. But home industries have been restored and centralized, and this has tended to emancipate the Irish from their economic thraldom to England. Formerly the Irish farmers did not carry on their farming on a business basis, and in the beginning the organizers had to do almost all the business themselves; today Irish farmers successfully conduct their own coöperative societies.

With the political future of Ireland in mind, the authors of the book discuss the social and educational values of coöperation to the Irish people. "Not only has the coöperative method aided the Irish farmers in the development of greater individual powers as wealth producers and as business men, but also it has taught them their responsibilities as members of a social community and an organized state." Discussing the difference between coöperation and socialism, the authors recognize that both have a common aim; however, in its combination of the finer individualism and the more practical socialism, the cooperative ideal as worked out in Ireland forms a complete program of social reconstruction. Coöperators realize that there is no short cut to their heaven on earth, that society cannot be revolutionized and all its evils extirpated by any mere change in political programs and administrations. They are willing to climb into heaven upon a ladder constructed of the most earthly, trivial things, to build a new world of free men beginning with the unromantic producing and distributing of the everyday necessities of life.

A Chosen People

Chosen Peoples. The Hebraic Ideal versus the Teutonic. By Israel Zangwill. The Macmillan Company.

THIS book by Israel Zangwill is the reproduction of a lecture delivered by him before the Jewish Historical Society of England, on the birthday of Arthur Davis, a notable Anglo-Jewish scholar. It appeared originally in *The Menorah Journal*, published in New York, and is now reprinted with a foreword from the pen of Herbert Samuel, the English statesman, and an afterword by Dr. Israel Abrahams upon the life of Arthur Davis. The purpose of the little volume is avowedly apologetic. It is to refute the allegation frequently voiced in England during the war, that "Germanism is Judaism," that the arrogance of military Germany with its "Deutschland, Deutschland über Alles" is directly traceable to the conception of a Chosen People as evolved by the Jews.

One may well question whether the task which the author has set before himself is worth while. Mr. Zangwill is undoubtedly aware of the fact that in Germany the current charge against the Jew is that Germanism is *not* Judaism and that that charge has led to a furious recrudescence of Anti-Semitism among the champions of the Teutonic ideal. As an observer of human nature and as a self-respecting Jew, Mr. Zangwill might possibly have done better to dismiss such an allegation as one of the sacrifices of the intellect which are not less numerous and not less costly than the sacrifices in blood demanded by the World War. But leaving aside the question as to the necessity of Mr. Zangwill's defense, one is glad to acknowledge that the defense itself is both brilliant and effective. His line of argument is a double one. On the one hand, he points out that, in diametrical opposition to the German idea, the Biblical conception of a Chosen People, as formulated by the Prophets, is based upon spiritual rather than upon physical factors; that it expresses itself in self-denunciation rather than in self-glorification: "the doctrine of election made not for arrogance, but for a sense of *noblesse oblige*." On the other hand, Mr. Zangwill contends that the idea of election is not limited to Israel, but is found among all great and masterful nations. He illustrates his thesis by particular reference to the history of England and America. "We have before our very eyes the moving spectacle of the newest of nations setting herself through a President-Prophet the noblest mission ever formulated outside the Bible." (But compare this exaltation of the President with the violent denunciation of him found in one of Mr. Zangwill's recent articles.)

That Mr. Zangwill's treatment of the subject is fascinating as well as penetrating, and that his little volume shows, in addition, evidence of wide reading and considerable erudition, is nothing new to those who know him as a thinker and scholar, and not merely as an entertaining novelist. The reviewer, however, cannot suppress a mild protest against the manner in which Mr. Zangwill has allowed scholarly ballast to overload the frail craft of an essay to the sinking point. The literally bewildering multitude of learned quotations and allusions culled from every conceivable corner of the storehouse of human knowledge, in many cases irrelevant to the question under discussion, makes it difficult for the reader to follow the argument of the author and mars the effect which is intended by him. Mr. Zangwill, to paraphrase H. G. Wells's penetrating observation regarding the modern Jew, is not clever enough to hide his cleverness.

Psychiatry and War

Thoughts of a Psychiatrist on the War and After. By William A. White. Paul B. Heber.

THE radical readjustment which war entails gives the specialist in mental disorder his warrant for judgment; for the psychiatrist deals individually with just such complex disturbances as war presents on a massive scale. Dr. White speaks with the confidence of an expert, and his thesis is as important in bearing as it is convincing in statement. The psychological conflict that is inherent in human nature under the strains and pressures of the struggle to live and live amply and richly, is the battle of motives founded in instincts—instincts of food, and sex, and mastery. Civilization marks the changes in the mode of expressing these persistent motives of conduct. The critical point in the control of impulse is the domination of the herd interest above the individual satisfaction. As the several instincts are integrated to a common welfare in the normal individual, so must they also be in the body social. That is the critical distinction. Killing for selfish ends has long been considered the crime of crimes; killing is considered the duty of the soldier because he is supposed to be serving the common good. The child matures by control of impulse, by repression, by sublimation—the turning of impulses to socially sanctioned ends and means. Reversion presents conduct analogous to that of the undeveloped race, the infantile mind. War releases repressed impulses, sends men back years or æons on the laborious path; hence, loot and lust and passion and hate and cruelty and unreason rampant. War reveals the common character of our subconscious selves upon which we have reared the control that is the measure of our civilization. The analogy serves in detail: war hate is infantile or primitive in motive and pattern; war prejudice and unreason is of the same parentage. But equally and inherently war, when it involves the sacrifice of the individual for the social good, releases high motives and noble undertakings. Both the causes of war and the conduct of war, no less than the setting of war in the hearts and minds of men, are thus rationalized by Dr. White in a psychological interpretation.

As to the future, psychology can guide though not predict. Under the principle that the individual can realize his fullest expression only under the richest social development—and reciprocally social development depends upon high individual growth—the nation becomes the unit in the larger integration of the civilized world. Nations have to undergo the repression and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sublimation which society imposes in the school of life. That the collective standards may show regression in comparison with the individual ones, is plain. "Lying and deceit of all kinds are pretty well tabooed as types of individual action, but they are still in evidence in the diplomatic inter-relations between nations." There is no reason why the same process that has disciplined the ancient instincts to a new service under the spirit of coöperation should not be extended to the larger integration, still composed of the same types of humanity, the ultimate brotherhood of men. The path is more difficult by the circumstance that the social sentiment has been limited to the task of effecting the salvation of the individual. But the psychiatrist adds his hope to the hopes of the advocates of a league of nations that shall make it possible to outgrow war, as men in socialized communities have outgrown their older, cruder ways. Such a confirmation of our political hopes by scientific analysis is encouraging; and Dr. White maintains his thesis with skill and interest.

History and Romance

The Secret Battle. By A. P. Herbert. Alfred A. Knopf.
The Historical Nights' Entertainments. (Second Series.) By Rafael Sabatini. J. B. Lippincott Company.
Seldwyla Folks. By Gottfried Keller. Translated by Wolf von Schierbrand. Brentano's.

MOST novels of the war have been, inevitably and rightly, propaganda novels. In a sense all art is, of course, propaganda. By giving your own vision you exclude that of others. To select and to emphasize is in itself to preach. And when the vision is an impassioned one, as was the case with the war, the appearance of propaganda will be proportionately sharp and open. Mr. Herbert has attempted to reduce this element of personal fervor to its minimum. He has striven to keep himself out of his book. Having seen so much, it is inconceivable that he saw no more; having reflected thus far, he can hardly convince us that he has let his thought stray no farther. But he evidently and perhaps rightly considered that to draw any ultimate consequences from his story in the world of conduct would have diminished its inherent force.

That force is very great. Mr. Herbert has told of the inner battle of a sensitive man whose sheer moral energy bore him again and again into experiences for which he was wholly unfitted, who thus attained to a height of sheer heroism that the unimaginative can never reach, but who, with nerves and inner resistance worn thin at last, was condemned and shot by a court martial for cowardice in the face of the enemy. The first half of the book describes the campaign on the burning sands of Gallipoli. Here Mr. Herbert's studious sobriety and restraint create a physical and moral picture of very deep impressiveness. Thither Harry Penrose went as to a great and righteous adventure. He looked across the straits to the "ringing plains of windy Troy" and likened himself to those who had once manned the Grecian ships. He found flies and corruption, crushing weariness and foul disease. His romantic impulses perished. But urged on by an inner necessity for self-justification he reenlists for France. He becomes a scout officer of the highest efficiency. The terrible impressions, however, have gone not through but into him. They have gradually sapped his strength, which collapses in a single moment that leads to disgrace and a death called shameful.

Mr. Herbert, as we have said, permits himself to draw no conclusions. His simple-hearted narrator is not even sure that, although one of the bravest men he ever knew was shot for cowardice, one ought openly to disapprove the death penalty in such cases. But at a wholly unemphatic moment he lets one of his characters casually express the substance of Andreas Latzko's passionate reproach: War that involves moral or physical conscription applies to men of all temperaments a single, rigid test of manhood. And that test is the lowest one conceivable. For the noblest minds and organizations, the personally and socially finest, will find filth and blood and the business of slaughter hardest to endure. The actual soldier must feel as little as possible and not doubt at all. The consequence is that a very great war which applies this test of the fitness to survive, and applies it long and stringently enough, will leave civilization in the hands of the callous and the stupid. Such are the reflections to which Mr. Herbert will arouse every mind by his quiet, exact, and well wrought narrative.

Mr. Rafael Sabatini is a genuine benefactor. The conventional historical novel is too unreal to be even amusing. But these narratives of his succeed in beguiling us away from the insistent and troubling present. Usually, too, one has the pleasant consciousness of extending one's historical information. Hence few contemporary books blend the delightful and the useful so agreeably. And since Mr. Sabatini tells us when and to what extent he has departed from the strict authority of the sources, we always know precisely where we are at. He uses his imagination, of course, in vitalizing his material. But that imagination is a scrupulous one, controlled by learning, a desire for truth, a ripe and (in the best sense) worldly sagacity. His matter is at times lurid enough, as in that incident of the false Demetrius which attracted both Schiller and Hebbel. At others it has possibilities of easy pathos, as in the fate of Amy Robsart. Yet he never approaches either the melodramatic or the sentimental. At every turn his book illustrates the finest traits of the true humanist, of the creative mind in scholarship. Perhaps his best narratives are The Hermosa Fembra, colorful, tragic, and impassioned, and The Path of Exile, in which the grave beauty of Clarendon's character stands out against the glitter and corruption of Charles's court. But there is none that is not wholly admirable, none that does not inspire an earnest hope for the indefinite continuance of a series of which this is the second instalment.

Gottfried Keller is one of the authentic masters of European literature of the middle years of the nineteenth century. It was inevitable that sooner or later an attempt should be made to extend the limits of his just fame. In "Seldwyla Folks" Mr. Wolf von Schierbrand presents in fairly adequate translation three novelettes from the celebrated "Leute von Seldwyla": the quaintly significant Three Decent Combmakers, the clear and yet glowing historical narrative Dietegen, the sombre and profoundly poetic Romeo and Juliet of the Village. But Mr. von Schierbrand was ill-advised, we fear, in trying to gain a hearing for his author by representing him as a Swiss and not a German writer. Keller was an ardent Swiss patriot and for years a devoted servant of his native city. But the irascible little master would have been horrified, as Mr. von Schierbrand must know, at any attempt to divide him from the ethnic and linguistic civilization which absorbed him wholly. It is true, as Mr. von Schierbrand says, that the Swiss peasant dialect—which Keller did not use—differs from normal literary German, though not more than an illiterate cockney's English differs from Galsworthy's. But so also does the East Low German of Simon Dach, the West Low German of Fritz Reuter, the Alemannic of Hebel, the Silesian of Hauptmann, the Bavarian of the folk jests in the Munich comic papers. Such propaganda is as unscholarly as it is futile. Next some one will tell us, with an equally kind motive, that, since the treaty of Versailles is ratified, Rainer Maria Rilke is a Czecho-Slovak poet and that Andreas Hofer was an Italian patriot. And if ever the wind of doctrine pipes from another quarter there will be the great game of proving that the Genevese men of letters with Alemannic names, from Edmond Scherer to Henry Spiess, contributed to Swiss or even German literature and not to French; that Maeterlinck and Verhaeren and Kystemaekers belong to Flanders; that since the peasant dialects of Provence and Normandy differ from current literary French, France cannot really claim Daudet or Maupassant; that the two Dumas, father and son, clearly belong to Africa; and Halèvy, Catulle Mendès, Lichtenberger, and Bergson to Zion!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

ONE of the most interesting questions of the present day is the attitude the churches are to take toward revolutionary impulses in society. There are few books more enlightening—and consoling—on this point than "The Church and Its American Opportunity" (Macmillan), a collection of the addresses given at the recent Episcopal Congress at the Cathedral in New York. The program of the Congress was prepared with great care by a competent body of clergymen and more than half of the speakers invited to address the assembly took advanced positions upon the subjects discussed. The speakers are unanimous in the opinion that the preparation of the ministry must be adjusted to the changing needs of the times and even that the sacred prayer-book must be revised. It is true that the readjustment in both cases is but mild. One of the proposed improvements in the Book of Common Prayer is a service for the anointing of the sick with oil in the name of the Lord. One of the speakers, too, insists that in the contemplated revision nothing must be done to disturb the exquisite balance between the Catholic and Protestant elements of the book, which renders it so effective as a common book of prayer. But all the three speakers upon this revision seem to agree that there must be more elasticity in the services of worship. The two speakers on the place of the Old Testament in public worship differ, one of them being in favor of using it most sparingly, asking if the Christ of the Nicene Creed has not as many points of contact with Greek philosophy as with the Old Testament, and citing with appreciation the suggestion of a missionary that in foreign lands the ancient religious books of those lands should take the place of the Old Testament in the canon of Scripture. But in the economic and sociological addresses the radical tendency among the speakers is even more marked. Two of three speakers argue for the establishment of a Labor party in America, and there is cited with favor the declaration of Bishop Brent that the pronunciamento of the British Labor party was the most religious utterance of the war. Two of three speakers seem to favor the League of Nations, one rejecting it on the ground of "curtailment of national liberty." Of three speakers on the effect of the war on religion, two of them soberly protest against the prevailing superpatriotism of the day. In a particularly masterly address Dr. William Austin Smith, the editor of *The Churchman*, inveighs against the folly of attributing the war to Treitschke, Nietzsche, and Bernhardi instead of to competition for the world's markets. The war, he says, demands that the church should define its enthusiasms; he rejoices that the spirit of freedom is bound to touch religion; he calls for a revolution in the churches without which he has small hope of Christian unity. It is perfectly clear that the leaders of the Episcopal church, at least, do not mean to purvey the stones of theology and liturgics to those who are asking for bread. It is surely significant to read sentences like these in a volume marked with an Episcopal *Nihil obstat:* "None but cave-dwellers believe any longer in apostolical succession." "Without those results [of scholarship] the Bible today may become a stumbling block to faith." "To the Christian the competitive system presents a spectacle of government by force which is intolerable."

THE sound of Lenin's name strikes jarringly upon normal American ears. It brings with it a host of sinister suggestions—revolution, anarchy, German fraud, Machiavellianism. What success is to be looked for from desultory attempts to eradicate an impression hammered in by daily strokes from the press, the platform, the pulpit? Especially when such attempts are made as injudiciously as by Mr. A. R. Williams in "Lenin, the Man and his Work" (Scott and Seltzer). This account suffers from the lack of a precise view of Lenin's mind, from a good deal of irrelevancy, and from the spirit of hero-worship by which it is thoroughly colored. No one will care much about the glimpses of Lenin's private virtues or of his amiability in moments of intimacy with the writer, nor will readers be persuaded by a view which makes the Russian leader in knowledge infinite, in wisdom perfect, in judgment unerringly prophetic—particularly as the illustrations are rather trifling. Mr. Williams redeems his ill-focused and loosely written impressions by including in his book the sharply-etched outline of Lenin by William Hard, extracted from the forthcoming "Raymond Robins's Own Story." This characterization is simple and consistent in aiming at nothing beyond an explanation of the secret of Lenin's power, which it shows to be based on a full understanding of the popular mind, on a realistic appreciation of useful practical measures, and on the ability to adapt policies to the prevailing exigencies. Better than any one else among either his opponents or followers, Lenin diagnosed the sickness of the Russian nation, and almost alone he dared to propose the heroic remedy. He attends laboriously to details, and is therefore less of a doctrinaire than other members of his party. He retains his leadership by knowing when to yield. In short, he has captured the confidence of the great majority of the Russians, if we are to believe Mr. Robins, not merely by convincing them of his wholehearted devotion to their interests, but by demonstrating sober sagacity in guiding the recreation of their economic life. Such is the impression produced by Mr. Hard's analysis. Like that of Mr. Williams it is extremely favorable to Lenin, but it is distinctly more intelligible. Though we should like to have a fuller record of his constructive labors, Mr. Hard's account comes very near to justifying the designation of Lenin as "the greatest living statesman in Europe"—a designation similar to which, spoken by an unfriended Russian somewhere in Connecticut, is reported to have been made the excuse for sending him to jail.

THE romantic traveller who, in sunny mornings before the war, delighted in following through narrow Paris streets the trail of Jean Valjean or Little Billee or Trompe-la-Mort, and who has thrilled at midnight to the spectral beauty of the cathedral which still seems the carapace of Hugo's Quasimodo, will rejoice over "Paris of the Novelists" by Arthur Bartlett Maurice (Doubleday, Page). No city of Europe has so allured the minds of novelists as Paris; none served as background for so many chapters in French and English fiction. The author, an ardent admirer and a traveller from the impressionable days of childhood, has in later years returned to France to follow out all these literary trails. The all-but-forgotten Paris of the historical novels, of Hugo, of Thackeray and Dickens, of Dumas *père*, the Paris of Balzac, the slums of Eugene Sue's heroes, the purlieus of Paul de Koch and Gaboriau, rise in succession from the spacious boulevards left by the Haussmann *démolitions;* we are conducted through the Bohemian Paris of Murger and Du Maurier, and the more recent city of Daudet, Zola, and Maupassant. One chapter is given to the heroes of the later English novels, another to the Americans from Poe to the present day. Then, in the last third of the volume, the literary trail takes the author away toward the provinces, from Versailles and Fontainebleau down the winding Seine of Maupassant, into the Normandy which he shares with so many others; on pilgrimages to the Tarascon of Tartarin, to the Marseilles of Edmond Dantes and—finally—Joseph Conrad; to the Touraine of Balzac and Walter Scott; and to the northern country described in the war stories of the last five years. Interested equally in the authors and in their characters, Mr. Maurice delights in tracing their own journeys and fixing their places of residence in the capital; he stops to talk of their personalities, their little vanities, or their manner of composition. No pure antiquarian, he interlards his chapters with anecdotes and bits of gossip, and the triteness of many of these sketches is redeemed by much less familiar data on men like Murger and Du Maurier, Arnold Bennett and Leonard Merrick, and other contemporaries from whom he could get letters. Though written *con amore*, the tone is that of a journal or note-book; it is personal and even sentimental, but rarely vivid in descriptive force. Inevitably one compares its pallid color

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to the living pages of the masterpieces it recalls, and inevitably one chafes a little under the topographic leash—a thread which even in a master's hands could scarcely provide a chain of interest between books so different as those of Balzac and Gaboriau, Thackeray and Harry Leon Wilson. Still, the book will certainly be useful to the omnivorous novel-reader and far from useless to students of literature generally, who too often neglect that humble sister of the Muses, topography.

IT is not a literary background, but a living, breathing metropolis that the late John F. Macdonald envisaged in the pages of "The Amazing City" (Lippincott). As a journalist he was interested less in the dead Paris of history than in the kindly, cheerful, infinitely amused, and infinitely amusing Parisians of pre-war days. The sympathetic soul who can rejoice with street-singers, and to whom the loss of a neighbor's laundry is a tragedy, will find much entertainment in this collection of essays and critical sketches. Made up of a series of articles which appeared from 1907 to 1913 in various English newspapers and reviews, the volume links together the two previously published series, "Paris of the Parisians" (1900) and the posthumous "Two Towns—One City." Mr. Macdonald had exceptional opportunities to observe both the serious and the gay sides of life in the city of his affection and his labors; during these years he was dramatic critic of the French stage for *The Fortnightly Review* and regular contributor to several London newspapers. Hence the articles on Capus, Brieux, the reactionary plays of Bourget, and the interesting account of the preparation and production of Rostand's "Chantecler." Life in the Latin Quarter, the Steinheil trial, the last three presidents of the French Republic, the career of the journalist Henri Rochefort—these are some of the subjects dealt with. The author has no political or didactic bias; his aim, seen most clearly in his dramatic criticism, is to interpret to English readers the reasonableness, kindness, sense of justice, and delight in simple pleasures which he considers the typical French virtues. His characteristic lightness of touch finds its best subjects in the life of *la petite bourgeoisie*—little genre pictures which by their style quite compensate for their slightness, which appears more striking now that they are brought together in a volume.

THE student of Ibsen will find a useful reference book in Miriam Alice Franc's "Ibsen in England" (Four Seas Company). It presents in a compact little volume material hitherto widely scattered in books, prefaces, and periodicals. Miss Franc tells of Ibsen's introduction to the English reading public through the reviews and essays written by Mr. Edmund Gosse between 1871 and 1880; of the various performances, amateur and professional, of Ibsen plays from 1880 down to the outbreak of the World War; of such theatrical enterprises as the Independent Theatre, which dared to inaugurate its career with "Ghosts"; and of the battle royal waged over Ibsen's morals and his art in the early nineties—the era of "ghosts and gibberings." The entertaining chapter on the Ibsen controversy has the usual fun at the expense of the vituperative and hysterical "antis," but notes, too, that the most brilliant of the Ibsenites were sometimes provoked to retorts that damaged their cause: as when Mr. William Archer tactfully pointed out that the French critics of Ibsen were men of letters, whereas the English were jaded theatrical journalists; or when Bernard Shaw enraged an already irritated public by proclaiming Ibsen superior in technique to Shakespeare. And no anti-Ibsenite was more successful in ridiculing the symbolism of "The Master-Builder" than the appreciative Ibsenite who seriously maintained that Solness's career was intended to symbolize Gladstone's. Ibsen had an unfortunate attraction for cranks. Miss Lord's 1888 translation of "Ghosts" expounds in the preface an amazing theory about man-souls and woman-souls, who sometimes lodge in bodies of the opposite sex and so promote such disorders as cause the tragedy of "Ghosts"—disorders to be cured by Christian Science. It was fortunate for Ibsen when Mr. Archer took up the task of translating and editing. A chapter on Ibsen parodies and sequels; a rapid summary of Ibsen's influence on English drama in general and on particular plays of Shaw, Pinero, Galsworthy, and others; an attempt to account for the comparative failure of Ibsen on the English stage; and two useful appendices—lists of English translations and performances—complete a book that often succeeds in being entertaining as well as useful.

PHOTOGRAPHERS who have missed a training in fundamental æsthetic theory rather than in technique will find much to help them in "The Fine Art of Photography" (Lippincott) by Mr. Paul L. Anderson. The author holds that "a photograph cannot rank as a work of art unless it carries some suggestion of a lofty emotion" and that "this result is rarely attained without the intervention of the artist himself through hand work on either plate or print." With this as a criterion, he sets forth and discusses the essential principles by which the painter is guided and their application to his particular field. Herein, rather than in the practical hints and suggestions, valuable as they are, lies the chief usefulness of the book, which after a hundred pages devoted to the elements of composition and "values" takes up in specific chapters Landscape, Marines, Winter Work, Architecture, Genre, Portraits, Motion-picture Work. Most useful are the chapters on composition—largely inspired by the much discussed treatise of H. R. Poore, who by his analytic rather than synthetic point of view seems to have had the photographer particularly in mind—and the very full and practical discussion of portraiture, which the author considers the special *métier* of the camera. The chief faults of the volume are a trite and tediously discursive method of presentation, and a tendency to dogmatize, on moot points no less than on commonplaces, which is exasperating in even an elementary treatment of æsthetic theory. But as a guide to the ambitious student the book will have its value as it certainly has its place.

WOMEN about to get a divorce because they have sounded the depths of marital variety and found it wanting, had best not apply to Mr. Robert Grant, Judge of the Probate Court, Boston. On the other hand, in his pertinent book, "Law and the Family" (Scribners), legal only in its occasional Latin derivatives and humorous in its tales of patient Griseldas and deaf mutes' hubbubs in court, Mr. Grant triumphantly points out that the legal status of woman in the family has been secured. Her increased chances for economic independence and the present-day policy of awarding the child to the mother, unless meretricious, make it no longer necessary for women to endure marital wrongs of a harsh or servile nature. Thus far a true feminist, Mr. Grant then adjures woman to use her power carefully, and hails as a menace to marriage those heroines of modern fiction (H. G. Wells is cited) who capriciously leap from arm to arm. Mr. Grant, furthermore, while welcoming the "full legal stature of the child" as compared with his status as property in the past, convincingly urges uniform marriage laws. His liberal principles, characteristic, he would have us believe, of the modern law court, are again shown in his belief that testators should not bind their heirs in the disposition of their property. Perhaps the best suggestion in this slow-moving book of encouragement and warning is that women enter the profession of trusteeship, with the reassuring declaration that stocks and bonds are no harder than algebra. The book leaves the reader with the gratifying conviction that law is not really mechanical and complex, and that woman is coming into her own. It is recommended to crabbed old gentlemen about to make clever young people their heirs, husbands still doling out meagre weekly pittances, or wives wanting legal separation because their husbands "smoke in bed."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Drama

The Cult of Violence

MELODRAMA, it is commonly held, owes its character to astute plotting and to moments of intensely heightened conflict. The briefest observation of our stage destroys that theory at once. Our average melodrama is structurally stupid. Its continuance depends on some trick that a clever child could see through. At some crucial moment a false reticence or nobility is feigned and the action rattles ahead for want of three words of explanation that only perversity coupled with dulness could have withheld. There is no nimbleness of invention in these plays. The plots are monotonous and heavy; the final act is, as a rule, openly bankrupt of ingenuity or resourcefulness. Of this fact the audiences are not unaware. It is possible to overhear jesting comments on it from people of no startling intelligence. Yet these people will go again and again, and melodramas are—far beyond farce or sentimental comedy—the safest investments of the commercial managers.

The explanation is not far to seek. It lies in the extreme psychical gregariousness of the average American. Spiritual isolation has no bracing quality for him. To be in a minority makes him feel indecent to the point of nakedness. His highest luxury is the mass enjoyment of a tribal passion. War, hunting, and persecution are the constant diversions of the primitive mind. And these that mind seeks in the gross mimicry of melodrama. Violence, and especially moral violence, is shown forth, and the audience joins vicariously in the pursuits and triumphs of the action. Thus its hot impulses are slaked. It sees itself righteous and erect, and the object of its pursuit, the quarry, discomfited or dead. For the great aim of melodrama is the killing of the villain. Whether he be tribal enemy or moral or social dissenter, he is permitted small successes, shadowy evasions, brief exultations. But these are known to be momentary and felt as rudely ironic. The net tightens, its cords cut closer and closer into the victim's flesh until the magnificent instant of the clicking handcuff or the whirring bullet is ripe.

Stronger and deeper is the final instinct that adds fierceness and joy to the mimic man-hunt of melodrama. The villain, whether tribal enemy, mere foreigner, or rebel against the dominant order, is always represented as an unscrupulous rake. He attacks the honor of native women, and thus—especially if his skin is a tinge darker—there is blended with the other motives of pursuit the motive of a vicarious lynching party of the orthodox kind. The melodrama of this approved pattern brings into vicarious play those forces in human nature that produce mob violence in peace and mass atrocities in war. Nations addicted to physical violence of a directer and simpler kind have cultivated the arena and the bull ring. Those who desire their impulses of cruelty to seem the fruit of moral energy substitute melodrama.

It should be emphasized that the motives of these plays are constant in character. They return in each season and in many superficially different forms. A group of last year's melodramas would illustrate them no worse and no better than the group that holds our stages today. The variations are flimsy; the foundation is one. There is Mr. Elmer A. Rice's "For the Defense" (The Playhouse). Its villain is a Hindoo physician, not a "white man." His consulting room reeks with incense, champagne, and subtlety. He tries to ensnare young women. A splendid young district attorney who cannot speak any foreign "lingo"—"straight American" is good enough—pursues him. The "heathen dog" (as another Hindoo was called last year in a similar play) is shot. There is Mr. Channing Pollock's "The Sign on the Door" (The Republic Theatre). It is simpler. The villain is an American, though of French descent. He has had an affair with a married woman. He "took advantage" of her when she was "lonesome." An irate and sturdy husband, who divides women into "good cattle" and "bad cattle," shoots him and will of course not even be tried. This piece admirably illustrates the sex morality of melodrama: women are devoid of will and hence of all moral responsibility. They are apt, poor dears, to long for change and companionship. But whoever yields to their amiable weakness must be shot at once. In "The Whirlwind" (The Standard Theatre) an evil Mexican pursues the heroine. His intentions, as a matter of fact, are quite honorable according to the code of melodrama. But an American loves Chiquita. Hence the "greaser" must be the villain. He is refused at the altar; his estates are confiscated. The pure, dauntless American hero rides off with the Indian maiden. These three plays are pure examples of the melodrama of self-glorification, pursuit, and moral violence. Miss Rita Weiman's "The Acquittal" (The Cohan and Harris Theatre) is more ingenious in method and cooler in temper. It has more the effect of having been written, less that of having been dictated through a megaphone. The villain's crime is for once both credible and detestable. But the author had her finger on the moral pulse of her audience when she counted upon its passionate approval of his defeat and disgrace not primarily because he had murdered a good man for money, but because he had not kept his marriage vows. That fact illustrates pointedly the infinitely curious psychology of the audience. The dramatic critic can only set it down. The student of society should find it of extraordinary significance.

Finally there is "The Purple Mask" (The Booth Theatre). It, too, is a melodrama. But it is adapted from the French. It is not American at all, and we are at once in another world. Not merely in another world of costumes and manners. That would matter little. But in another universe of the moral life. There is neither rancor nor ferocity. Bonapartists and royalists have gaiety and gallantry and humanity. The royalist gentleman, as befits a romantic melodrama, is the hero and achieves his little triumph. But no one is hated or hounded or shot. Citizen Brisquet is a worthy opponent of the Comte de Trevières and the plume of neither is in the dust. It is all trivial enough. The bravery is thin and brittle. The glossy silks are sham and the flashing swords are of tin. One remembers the elder Dumas, but the play will not bear the comparison. And so one rather regrets that Mr. Leo Ditrichstein must spend his fine gifts—his suavity, his mellow pathos, his unfailing personal magnetism—on such ephemeral effects. But one can see the play without inner shame, without the consciousness of having witnessed a brutality that stains the mind. Such a consciousness is nearly always with one in the presence of our native melodramas.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Historians and Political Scientists at Cleveland

NEITHER the American Historical Association nor the American Political Science Association, both of which organizations, reconvening after an interval of two years, held their annual meetings at Cleveland December 27-January 1, allowed the war to overshadow entirely the other interests with which they have long been severally concerned. The American Historical Association, with which was also joined the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, devoted special sessions to ancient history, the history of the Mississippi Valley region, American economic history, Hispanic-American and European history, and American colonial history, in addition to two sessions dealing with agricultural history and a conference on history and education for citizenship in the schools. A conference on the history of science, presided over by Professor George L. Burr, of Cornell, was an interesting new departure. The program of the Political Science Association, in addition to war topics, offered sessions on recent State Constitutions, budgetary reform (a joint meeting with the National Municipal League), and national administration.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was inevitable, however, that topics bearing upon the war should be the more numerous and serve to awaken the larger interest. It cannot in justice be said that the war papers of the Historical Association program, taken as a whole, were of a high order, or that they forecast conclusively that scientific detachment and all-round view which the future American historian of the war ought, one might suppose, preëminently to take. The presidential address of Mr. William Roscoe Thayer was an unimportant threshing over of the old straw of German errors and offenses, and was negligible as a refutation of the "fallacies in history" which it ostensibly discussed. Professor Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard, in a paper on the Franco-German frontier, offered a complacent justification of the treatment of the Rhine and the Saar Valley by the Peace Conference, only to have the inconclusiveness of his presentation deftly pointed out by Mr. Alexander F. Whyte, M. P., of London, in a few witty strokes. Professor Robert H. Lord, of Harvard, who acted as an expert on Poland for the American peace delegation at Paris, was also a disappointment, his paper on the new Poland being compounded far more of optimistic recital and generalization than of facts such as the assembled historians were eager to know.

The Political Science Association was more fortunate. The presidential address of Professor Henry Jones Ford, of Princeton, on "Present Tendencies in American Politics," was a searching discussion of political changes and developments which have deprived American government of much of its representative character and have aggregated political power in the hands of officials and agencies which in practice are largely irresponsible. The centralizing tendencies which have produced in this country a mixture of oligarchy and autocracy instead of democracy are not to be checked, least of all eradicated, either by amending the Constitution or by improving Federal administration. It is the constitutional system, not merely its working under the conditions of party politics, that has proved defective; and where the system is at fault the only remedy is a new scheme. Professor Ford's able address, which it is to be hoped will reach a wider public than the membership of the Association affords, can hardly fail to strengthen the demand for a Federal Constitutional convention which is more and more being heard.

Two or three other papers on the program of the Political Science Association call for special comment. A paper by Professor Philip M. Brown, of Princeton, on the New Balkans of Central Europe, with special reference to Hungary, was a stinging arraignment of the Peace Conference for its blind and unprincipled treatment of the Balkan peoples, and a striking exposition of the political and racial conditions which seem destined to make the Balkans a region of war rather than of peace for years to come. Mr. Jerome Landfield, a member of the Russian Economic League at New York, gave a commendably clear account of the Russian revolution of November, 1917, although his acceptance of the Sisson documents and his apparent confidence in certain alleged new proofs of German intrigue at the time left a good deal to be desired. The outlines of a future Russian Constitution as seen by Russian liberals, embodying, apparently, most of the virtues of the British and American systems with few of their defects, were sketched by Baron S. A. Korff. Finally, Professor W. W. Willoughby, of Johns Hopkins, in an informal but able statement, summarized the political situation in the Far East with particular reference to China and Japan and the interests of Europe and the United States, in the course of which the conduct of Japan came in for severe handling. One could not but wish that, for the sake of historical completeness, the growing anti-imperialist sentiment in Japan might have received more adequate recognition.

The American Historical Association, long known for its many scholarly activities, continues most of its undertakings as before; the functions of the Public Archives Commission, however, are to be suspended for a year, pending, apparently, the virtual discontinuance of the Commission now that its work is

Focusing the World's Attention Upon Life After Death

Raymond, or Life and Death
With Examples of the Evidence for Survival of Memory and Affection After Death, by Sir Oliver Lodge ..... Price $2.50
No other book has so struck the deepest note of this epochal day as this. Ten years ago it would have found scoffers everywhere. Today—the outstanding phenomenon of the World Crisis is the world's passionate concern in life after death. "Raymond," a great book on the greatest of themes, has been a prominent feature of the press on both sides of the Atlantic.

Christopher
A Study in Human Personality by Sir Oliver Lodge $2.00
There is comfort here for all except the sceptic.

Science and Immortality
By Sir Oliver Lodge..... $2.50

Proofs of Life After Death
By Sir Oliver Lodge and Others..... $2.50
Seeking for comfort in a great sorrow, the editor made a collection of opinions as to a future life by some of the world's most eminent scientific men and thinkers.

Meeting of the Spheres
Or Letters from Dr. Coulter, by Charlotte G. Herbine $3.00
These are the most remarkable messages from the world of real life that lies just beyond what men call death. Highly constructive, helpful and comforting, and far the best book in the whole field of psychic literature.

Contact With the Other World
The latest evidence as to communication with the dead, by James H. Hyslop..... $5.00
A book that appeals to the deepest yearning of every intelligent person.

Voices From the Void
Six Years' Experience in Automatic Communication, by Hester Travers Smith..... $2.00
With an introduction by Professor Sir W. F. Barrett, F. R. S. $2.00

Life After Death
By James H. Hyslop..... $2.00
Problems of the future life and its nature.

The Vital Message
By Sir Arthur Conan Doyle..... $1.25
Sir Arthur Conan Doyle speaks with authority. Scholar, physician, writer, he has recently been devoting his life to this one absorbing subject—Are the Dead Really Dead?

The Dead Have Never Died
By Edward C. Randall..... $2.00

After Death
A Personal Narrative. Amanuensis W. T. Stead $1.25

The New Revelation
By Sir Arthur Conan Doyle..... $1.25

Peeps Into the Psychic World
By M. MacDermot Crawford..... $1.25

Postage Additional

BOOKSELLERS TO THE WORLD

BRENTANO'S

Retai Department
Fifth Avenue and 27th Street
New York City

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practically done; and the agreement with the Royal Historical Society for the maintenance of offices in London is to be terminated. The work of the Committee on the Bibliography of Modern English History is to be resumed, under the leadership of Professor Edward P. Cheyney, of the University of Pennsylvania; and the new Agricultural History Society is to be affiliated with the Association. The Association also voted to join the recently formed American Council of Learned Societies devoted to the Humanistic Studies, a body in which numerous organizations of scholars in this country and in Europe are represented. The formation at the Cleveland meeting of an American Catholic Historical Association, while in form and substance an independent enterprise, will, it is hoped, serve to increase interest in the study of American ecclesiastical history.

One striking episode which developed unexpectedly at the business session of the Historical Association should not pass unnoticed. Professor Hiram Bingham, of Yale, called the attention of the members to the fact that a paper on the recent attitude of the Brazilian press toward the United States and the Monroe Doctrine, which was to have been read at one of the sessions by William R. Manning, of the Department of State, had been withdrawn after the program was printed, at the request, it was said, of the Department. A motion offered by Professor Bingham and warmly seconded by Professor Burr, calling upon the Council to investigate the matter, was adopted. It will be interesting to know upon what ground, if any, the interference of the Department of State with the published program of a learned society is to be justified.

W. M.

Books of the Week

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Bourne, Randolph. Untimely Papers. Huebsch. $1.50.—Browne, Waldo R. (editor). Man or the State. Huebsch. $1.—Glasier, J. Bruce. Socialism in Scng. Manchester: National Labour Press. 6d.—Morley, Christopher. Mince Pie. Doran.—Van Vechten, Carl. In the Garret. Knopf.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Bassett, John Spencer. Our War with Germany. Knopf.—Brossolette, L. Histoire de la Grande Guerre. Paris: Armand Colin.—Georges-Gaulis, Berthe. La France au Maroc. Paris: Armand Colin.—Marcosson, Isaac F. Adventures in Interviewing. Lane. $4.—Guitteau, William Backus. Our United States; A History. Silver, Burdett & Co.—Rivington, Septimus. The Publishing Family of Rivington. London: Rivingtons.—Tillson, Christiana Holmes. A Woman's Story of Pioneer Illinois. Chicago: Lakeside Press.—Wallas, Graham. The Life of Francis Place. Knopf.

POETRY AND DRAMA

Allen, William Frederick. Monographs. Four Seas. $1.25.—Davis, Allan, and Anna R. Stratton. The Inward Light. Knopf.—Lomax, John A. (editor). Songs of the Cattle Trail and Cow Camp. Macmillan. $1.75.—Miles, Susan. Dunch. Longmans Green. 75 cents.—Seiffert, Marjorie Allen. A Woman of Thirty. Knopf.—Shanks, Edward. The Queen of China. Knopf.—Songs Unbidden. By The Prospector. Victoria, B. C.: Victoria Printing and Publishing Co.—Untermeyer, Louis. Modern American Poetry. Harcourt, Brace & Howe. $1.40.—Whitin, Cora Berry. Wounded Words. Four Seas. $1.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Hill, Hibbert Winslow. Sanitation for Public Health Nurses. Macmillan.—Peterson, Samuel. Democracy and Government. Knopf.—Pillsbury, W. B. The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism. Appleton. $2.50.—Spargo, John. The Psychology of Bolshevism. Harpers. $1.35.—Taylor, Henry C. Agricultural Economics. Macmillan.—Todd, Arthur James. The Scientific Spirit and Social Work. Macmillan. $2.—Waldman, Louis. The Great Collapse. Public Service Publishing Co.

LABOR, INDUSTRY, AND TRADE

Beyer, William C., Rebekah P. Davis, and Myra Thwing. Workmen's Standard of Living in Philadelphia. Macmillan.—Gompers, Samuel. Labor and the Common Welfare. Dutton. $3.—Partridge, G. C. The Psychology of Nations. Macmillan. $2.50.

RECONSTRUCTION AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Anderson, B. M. Effects of the War on Money, Credit and Banking in France and the United States. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Oxford University Press.—Antonelli, Étienne. Bolshevik Russia. Knopf.—Drake, Paul Harris. Democracy Made Safe. Four Seas. $1.25.—Sarolea, Charles. Europe and the League of Nations. Macmillan.—Ward, Harry F. The New Social Order. Macmillan. $2.50.

THE WAR

Holland, H. E. Armageddon or Calvary. Published by the Author.—Hammond, M. B. British Labor Conditions and Legislation During the War. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Oxford University Press.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Sellars, Roy Wood. Critical Realism: A Study of the Nature and Conditions of Knowledge. Rand & McNally.—Streeter, B. H. (editor). The Spirit. Macmillan. $2.50

FICTION

Pickard, Florence Willingham. Between Scarlet Thrones. Stratford. $1.50.—Sabatini, Rafael. The Historical Nights' Entertainment. Lippincott. $1.75.

SCIENCE

Annual Report of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, 1917. Washington: Government Printing Office.—East, Edward M. and Donald F. Jones. Inbreeding and Outbreeding. Monographs on Experimental Biology. Lippincott.—Goddard, Robert H. A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes. Smithsonian Institution.—Moulton, Rt. Hon. Lord. Science and War. Cambridge University Press.—Proceedings of the Medical Conference Held at the Invitation of the Committee of Red Cross Societies, Cannes, France. Geneva: The League of Red Cross Societies.—Walcott, Charles D. Cambrian Geology and Paleontology. Middle Cambrian Algae. Smithsonian Institution.

JUVENILE

De La Mare, Walter. The Three Mulla-Mulgars. Knopf.—Griffith, Eleanor Glendower. Cho-Cho and the Health Fairy. Child Health Organization of America.—Meiklejohn, Nannine LaVilla. The Cart of Many Colors. Dutton. $1.65.—Richards, Laura E. Joan of Arc. Appleton. $1.50.

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Contents

INDIA: The Disorders Inquiry—The Facts of the Amritsar Massacre—General Dyer's Testimony—British Air Raids—Amnesty in India—The Government of India Act..... 121

India

The Disorders Inquiry

THE fact that the Disorders Inquiry Committee in India, appointed to investigate nationalist disorders and discontent in the Punjab, is carrying on its work without the aid or support of the Indian National Congress, is explained in a statement published in the Lahore *Tribune* of November 19 and summarized below. The statement is signed by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the sub-committee appointed by the All-India Congress Committee.

Within ten days after the violent disturbances in the Punjab last spring, the All-India Congress Committee met at Bombay on April 20 and 21. After condemning all acts of violence, the Committee urged the Government to deal sympathetically with the situation by abandoning its policy of repression, and appointing a commission to inquire into the causes of discontent and the charges of excesses brought by local authorities against the native population. In the last week of May, Mr. Montagu announced in the House of Commons that the Government and the Viceroy recognized the necessity for such an inquiry. At a second meeting of the All-India Congress Committee, held on June 8 at Allahabad, a resolution was adopted asking for a parliamentary investigation both of the disorders and of the Government's methods in suppressing them.

At the same meeting, the Committee appointed a sub-committee to conduct an inquiry into the disturbances in the Punjab and other places, and to take such legal steps as might be necessary in connection with those disturbances. The sub-committee began its investigation on June 25, immediately after the withdrawal of martial law in the Punjab. When the appointment of Lord Hunter's Disorders Inquiry Committee was announced, the sub-committee devoted its efforts to collecting material for the use of the Committee. During September and October the sub-committee tried, through appeals to the Government of India, the Disorders Inquiry Committee, the Punjab Government, and the Secretary of State for India, to gain the right to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses through its own counsel, and to secure the release on bail or parole of native Punjab leaders whose evidence was needed to present the case of the people.

After protracted negotiations with the Punjab Government and Lord Hunter's Committee, representation by counsel with a limited right of cross-examination was granted. With regard to the release of the Punjab leaders, however, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab stated: ". . . it will not be possible to comply with this suggestion. If, however, the Committee desire to hear the evidence of any prisoner, this will be duly arranged. . . ." The Lieutenant-Governor later agreed to the release on parole of the principal leaders for the day or days on which they were required for testimony as witnesses.

This arrangement failed to satisfy the Congress sub-Committee. Government officials whose acts were under review by the Inquiry Committee were allowed to attend the Committee's hearings and even to instruct Government counsel. The sub-committee in a letter of protest to Lord Hunter refused to coöperate further with the Disorders Inquiry Committee. "It felt that if it was to discharge the trust laid upon it . . . it could not possibly engage in an inquiry in which the people's party was so heavily handicapped."

The Facts of the Amritsar Massacre

THE following summary of the chief events connected with the Amritsar massacre is taken from *The Manchester Guardian* of December 15.

Amritsar is one of the chief cities of the Punjab, and is the religious capital of the Sikhs, who supply some of our best fighting troops. The unrest which from a variety of causes made itself felt in India after the conclusion of the war, and which the Rowlatt Act was intended to overawe, but in fact accentuated, was most serious in the Punjab. At Amritsar it led to some very grave outrages. Several of the banks were looted and their managers killed, some important buildings were burned, and a woman, Miss Sherwood, a lady doctor connected with the Zenana Hospital, was set upon in the streets and beaten nearly to death. The Deputy Commissioner in charge of the civil government felt himself unable to deal with the situation and called in General Dyer, the military commander of the district, to whom he handed over the complete control of the situation. Martial law was not proclaimed, but General Dyer regarded himself as justified in acting as though it had been. He issued a proclamation forbidding all public assemblies and intimating that if any were held it would be liable to be fired upon without further notice. How far this extraordinary threat was understood or realized is of course doubtful, but in fact it was at once acted upon. On the afternoon of the day after the proclamation a meeting, estimated to consist of 5,000 people, was held at Jallianwala, a village in the immediate neighborhood. General Dyer proceeded thither from Amritsar with a small body of troops—some fifty rifles and two armored cars with machine-guns. He deployed his troops within the enclosure where the meeting was being held . . . opened fire within half a minute without calling on the meeting to disperse or giving any warning, went on firing on the struggling crowd for ten minutes, till the ammunition ran out, killed some 500 of them and wounded (according to his own estimate) about 1,500 more, left the dead and the dying where they fell, without any further concern, and departed quite satisfied with what he had done.

General Dyer's Testimony

THE following verbatim report of the greater part of the testimony of General Dyer, the officer in command of the British troops at Amritsar during the May disturbances, at the hearing on November 19 of the Disorders Inquiry Committee at Lahore, is taken from the *Tribune* (Lahore) of November 26. After testifying that on May 10 and May 11 a force consisting of 100 British and 200 Indian soldiers went from Jullundar to Amritsar, General Dyer stated that on May 11, in response to a telegram, he himself went to Amritsar by motor car.

Lord Hunter. When did you arrive there?—General Dyer. I think at about 8:30; night-time, anyway. . . .

Q. What information did you receive from Mr. Irving?—A. He said he could not deal with the situation any longer, that it was beyond all civil control, and that I should take matters in hand.

Q. I would like you to explain what you understood your position to be in consequence of Mr. Irving's statement?—A. Roughly, civil law was at an end and that military law would have to take its place for the time being.

Q. Is there any provision for such assumption when martial law is not introduced?—A. A situation might arise like that.

Q. So long as the civil authority exists in the town are you not in a position to render them assistance rather than super-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sede?—A. In ordinary cases, yes. This was an extraordinary case. It was handed over to me. Power was placed in my hands.

Q. Was it your opinion that that relieved you of any necessity for consulting Mr. Irving as the civil authority in question?—A. I think it relieved me of that, but at the same time I did consult him, as far as I remember, on all questions.

Q. Did you on the 11th proceed to the city?—A. I went that same night. It might have been eleven or twelve that night.

Q. Did you proceed at once to the *Kotwali?*—A. Yes.

Q. Did you see any sign of the mob?—A. There was no mob but I think I saw, as far as I can remember, the fire smouldering still.

Q. Did you, after the second conference, remove your headquarters to Rambagh?—A. Yes.

Q. Is that in the city itself?—A. It is near the city; not very far.

Q. Then later in the morning of the 12th did you proceed through the city with a column of available troops?—A. We went half around the city towards the (?) Sultanwind Gate and then I proceeded through the city.

Q. What troops had you, 100 British troops, 200 Indian soldiers, and two armored cars?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you proceed through the city to the place where you got reports as to mobs collecting?—A. There was a mob at the southern gate. We had a little difficulty in dispersing them. They would not go away immediately. I considered the advisability of opening fire on them. I though it would not be quite right, perhaps, and that I had better issue a proclamation personally before I took such a drastic measure. . . .

Q. On the occasion of this march through the city in what condition did you find the crowds?—A. I think they were very insolent.

Q. How did they show their insolence?—A. They were shouting *Hindu-Mussalman ki jai.* Then I ordered them to go away, but they would not move back. Certain members of the crowd spat on the ground as we passed along.

Q. Did you see any act of violence committed on that occasion?—A. No.

Q. During the day certain arrests were made by the police?—A. Yes.

Q. Were they made under military protection?—A. Yes.

Q. I think you had a proclamation prepared which appears in the Appendix to the report which you sent to the General Staff on the 25th August?—A. Yes.

Q. That proclamation, I see, is in the following terms: "The inhabitants of Amritsar are hereby informed if they will cause damage to any property or commit any act of violence in Amritsar or its environs, it will be taken for granted that such acts are due to incitement, and offenders would be punished according to military law. All meetings and gatherings are hereby prohibited and will be dispersed at once under military law." Who prepared that proclamation?—A. I think it was done by me or the Brigade-Major, or I may have dictated it to him and he wrote it.

Q. That was prepared on the evening of the 12th?—A. Yes.

Q. How was it issued?—A. Through the police, I believe.

Q. Do you know whether any measure was taken to ensure its publication to the citizens?—A. No. I cannot. I was most likely informed that it had been proclaimed. I am not certain.

Q. Would you kindly explain what was meant by dispersing the crowd under military law?—A. I would have to send them away—clear them out.

Q. According to military law, if you desired to disperse the crowd must you or must you not give them intimation that they are required to disperse before you resorted to the measure of firing?—A. We have to warn them and after that, if they do collect, they will be fired on.

Q. According to military law, will it or will it not be right to fire upon a crowd to disperse them without giving proper intimation? A. They had already had orders. If they would collect, it would be right.

Q. About this time had you any information about the collection of certain people outside the city?—A. I had intimation that evening that they were likely to collect with a view to loot the city.

Q. Who were these Majha Jats?—A. Sikhs who are largely recruited.

Q. Your view was that there was a serious danger of their engaging in looting the city?—A. Yes, very much.

Q. That evening about ten o'clock a party of British troops was sent to Mission Hospital?—A. Yes.

Q. Was that to rescue certain missionary ladies who were calling for help?—A. That's it.

Q. Did you also receive messages from other places indicative of great unrest in the neighborhood?—A. Yes, verbal messages. I could not take all down because I had to write my report many months later and I had a great deal of work to do. I did not take all the messages down. I was constantly hearing rumors and messages all through the 12th and 13th that the situation was growing more serious every moment.

Q. Among the places from where you had such messages were Dharival, Gurdaspur, Tarn Taran, Kasur, Lahore, and Hafizabad?—A. Yes.

Q. In consequence were troops sent from Amritsar?—A. I believe I had sent troops.

Q. On the morning of the 13th, did you form a resolution as to yourself making a declaration in the city?—A. I went there personally.

Q. What time did you start to make the proclamation?—A. I do not exactly remember the time. It might have been nine-thirty, perhaps. It might have been later.

Q. How long did you occupy in making the proclamation?—A. A long time. I may have been there two or three hours.

Q. Had you completed your proclamation before lunch time?—A. As far as I was concerned, I came away. It might have gone on after I left.

Q. The proclamation, I think, was made by a witness who has already given testimony to us?—A. Yes.

Q. Did he in his evidence indicate all the different parts of the city at which proclamation was read or are there other places where it was read in fact?—A. I believe it was properly read. I did not hear it at the time. I believe it was thoroughly explained. He took fair time every time.

Q. What I want to know is this: Are you aware of any other place than the places mentioned by him where the proclamations were made and explained to people who were brought together, as I understand, by the beating of the drum?—A. Drum was beaten. I did not quite understand.

Q. Perhaps you are not acquainted with the names of the places?—A. No.

Q. You did not go through the whole city?—A. I went to a good many places. I did not know Amritsar city well, so I could not say if I went to every quarter. (At this stage a map was handed to the President by the Government Advocate indicating the places at which the proclamation was made.)

Q. If you look at the map is it not evident that at many parts of the city, proclamation was not read at all?—A. Yes.

Q. The proclamation that was read on this occasion is mentioned in Appendix 3 to your report. It is in these terms: "It is hereby proclaimed that no person residing in the city is permitted or allowed to leave the city . . . without a pass from one of the following: . . ." Then it proceeds: "No person residing in the city is permitted to leave his house after eight. Any person found in the streets after eight is liable to be shot. No procession of any kind is permitted to parade the city or any part of the city or outside of it at any time. Any such procession or any gathering of four men will be looked upon and treated as an unlawful assembly and dispersed by force of arms if necessary. . . ." What is the significance of the qualifica-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion: "If necessary"?—A. Well, if I thought it necessary. It might not always be necessary.

Q. Does it mean or does it not mean that if you come upon a large meeting of people you would first ask them to disperse and would then fire if you find they refused to disperse?—A. It all depends on the circumstances. If I had been telling them all day and then they refused to do it, I should think there was no reason to talk to them any longer because they flouted my authority and it was not necessary to say any more.

Q. At the time the proclamation was issued was there any ejaculation by the crowd with reference to the proclamation?—A. I heard a good deal of noise. I was a little behind, perhaps. I did not always hear what they said.

Q. Can you personally testify to any distinct reference made by the crowd during the period you were issuing the proclamation?—A. I could not say. They were laughing. They were not behaving very well, evidently. I was told that they were saying that it was bluff; "They won't fire," and words to that effect. They were not to be afraid.

Q. When did you get information that a meeting would assemble at Jallianwala bagh?—A. I was in the city at the time. I cannot quite say what time it was; it may have been from 1:30 to 2 p.m.

Q. I see in this report to the General Staff you said: "It was at twelve-forty-five, on my way to the Rambagh, I was informed that in spite of my stern proclamation a big meeting would be held at Jallianwala bagh at four-thirty that afternoon?"—A. That's correct.

Q. On the assumption that it is correct, I want you to explain why you did not take measures to prevent the crowd from assembling at all at the Jallianwala bagh?—A. I went there as soon as I could. I had to organize my forces, to think the matter out. I had to organize my forces. I had to make up my mind what forces I was going to leave behind and where to post pickets. I thought I had done enough in warning them not to meet. If they were going to meet, I was going as fast as I could. I had to consider the military situation and make up my mind and it took a certain amount of time.

Q. Did the making of dispositions necessitate the occupation of the time between 12:40 to 4 p. m.?—A. I did not believe that they would really meet, after all that I had done in the morning. I did not think of sending off another force and warn them not to go. I had warned them all day up to the time I got back to Rambagh.

Q. When did you get definite information that in fact the meeting was being held?—A. At about four o'clock.

Q. From whom?—A. It was from Mr. Rehill, as far as I remember.

Q. When you received that information, what action did you take?—A. My plans were complete then, and I marched off towards the city soon after.

Q. Had you with you picketing parties?—A. I had picketing parties, and we all marched off together.

Q. You had a special party of twenty-five rifles of Gurkhas and twenty-five Sikhs?—A. Yes, there were forty other Gurkhas armed with *kukris*.

Q. You also had two armored cars?—A. Yes.

Q. Were those all the troops available after keeping picket reserves?—A. Every man available after providing for other things.

Q. You proceeded towards the Jallianwala bagh at a usual pace?—A. Ordinary walking pace.

Q. You did not consider there was any necessity for proceeding with any extra expedition?—A. No, sir. It was very hot. We went at the usual pace of marching.

Q. As you marched you dropped out the picket parties?—A. We marched till they came to the most convenient road to their destination, and they left us.

Q. As nearly as you can recollect it, what time did you reach Jallianwala bagh?—A. I think it was about 5 or 5:15 p. m. I could not say. I did not note the time.

Q. When you arrived at the Jallianwala bagh, what did you do?—A. I deployed my troops right and left, got the Gurkhas on the left and the Punjabs on the right.

Q. I think you had entered by the narrow entrance that leads into the Jallianwala bagh?—A. Yes.

Q. You had left your motor cars behind?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you have the Gurkhas who were armed with *kukris*, or were they at the back?—A. They, too, had come into the Bagh.

Q. Then you had forty Gurkhas and two columns of twenty-five men each, armed with rifles?—A. Yes.

Q. You said you deployed twenty-five soldiers to the right and twenty-four to the left, that is on the high ground on the north side of the rectangular space?—A. Yes.

Q. That is a very convenient piece of land?—A. Very.

Q. There are very few entrances and exits?—A. Yes, I think one wide, and there might have been two or three small exits. I had never seen the Bagh.

Q. When you got into the Bagh what did you do?—A. I opened fire.

Q. At once?—A. Immediately. I had thought about the matter and don't imagine it took me more than thirty seconds to make up my mind as to what my duty was.

Q. As regards the crowd, what was it doing?—A. Well, they were holding a meeting. There was a man in the centre of the place on something raised. His arms were moving about. He was evidently addressing.

Q. How far was this man from you and the military?—A. When I entered first, about eight or nine yards. He ran away to the right and there were a good many others who ran away and climbed over the wall.

Q. As I understand, at a distance of something like 100 yards from the place where you stationed the army, there is a ridge?—A. Yes.

Q. Where was the man who was addressing the crowd as compared with that?—A. He was absolutely in the centre of the square, as far as we could judge. I should say nearly fifty or sixty yards from where my troops were drawn up.

Q. Was there a great mass of crowd situated on the further side of the place from where you were, i. e., on the southern part of the Bagh?—A. Yes, I should think most of them were.

Q. He seemed to be surrounded by them?—A. Perhaps most of them were on the further side.

Q. So far as you know, was there anything occurring except this man addressing?—A. No, I could not see anything beyond that.

Q. How many people were in the crowd?—A. I then estimated them roughly at 5,000. I heard afterwards there were many more.

Q. On the assumption that there was a crowd of something like 5,000 listening, or more, have you any doubt that many of the people must have been unaware of your proclamation that you issued in the morning?—A. It had been well issued and news spreads very rapidly in a place like that under prevailing conditions. At the same time there may have been a good many who had not heard of the proclamation.

Q. On the assumption that there was that risk of people being in the crowd who were not aware of the proclamation, did it not occur to you that it was a proper measure to ask the crowd to disperse before you took that step of actually firing?—A. No, at the time I did not. I merely felt that my orders had not been obeyed, that martial law was flouted, and that it was my duty to immediately disperse by rifle fire.

Q. Before you dispersed the crowd, had the crowd taken any action at all?—A. No, sir. They had run away, a few of them.

Q. Did they start to run away?—A. Yes. When I began to fire the big mass in the centre began to run almost towards the right.

Q. Martial law had not been proclaimed. Before you took that step, which was a serious step, did you not consider as to the propriety of consulting the Deputy Commissioner, who was the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

civil authority responsible for the order of the city?—A. There was not any Deputy Commissioner to consult at the time. I did not think it wise to ask anybody further. I had to make up my mind immediately, as to what my action should be. I considered it from the military point of view that I ought to fire immediately, that if I did not do so, I should fail in my duty.

Q. When you left Rambagh did it occur to you that you might have to fire?—A. Yes, I had considered the nature of the duty that I might have to face.

Q. Did you not think it proper to have civil authority with you before you took that step?—A. I had a police officer with me.

Q. Who is that?—A. Mr. Rehill and Mr. Plomer were there.

Q. As I understand, Mr. Rehill and Mr. Plomer came on the scene after you actually commenced firing?—A. I think Mr. Rehill was there actually while the firing was going on.

Q. During the whole time?—A. I do not know. I was looking at my troops, but I saw him there. I did not wait longer after the firing and he was certainly there at the end of the firing.

Q. Before firing, did you ask Mr. Rehill whether in his judgment it was necessary to fire?—A. No, sir. My mind was made up, as I came along in my motor car, that if my orders were not obeyed, I would fire immediately.

Q. In firing, was it your object to disperse?—A. No, sir. I was going to fire until they dispersed.

Q. Did the crowd at once start to disperse as soon as you fired?—A. Immediately.

Q. Did you continue firing?—A. Yes.

Q. After the crowd indicated it was going to disperse, why did you not stop?—A. I thought it was my duty to go on until it dispersed. If I fired a little the effect would not be sufficient. If I fired a little I should be wrong in firing at all.

Q. For what length of time did the firing go on?—A. It might have been ten minutes, it might have been less. I think it was probably less from the number of rounds that were fired.

Q. So far as you could see, had the crowds sticks in their hands?—A. I could not say that they all had. I presume that a number had sticks. I knew they were going to be armed with sticks.

Q. Had you ever in your military experience to use similar methods of dispersing crowds?—A. Never. It was an exceptional case.

Q. What reason had you to suppose that if you had ordered the assembly to leave the Bagh, they would not have done so without the necessity of your firing and continuing firing for any length of time?—A. Yes, I think it quite possible that I could have dispersed them perhaps even without firing.

Q. Why did you not have recourse to that?—A. They would have all come back and laughed at me, and I should have made what I considered a fool of myself.

Q. In your view the situation was a very serious one?—A. A very serious one indeed.

Q. Had you had many communications from the neighborhood indicative of serious rising?—A. Yes.

Q. What conclusion had these different communications led you to as regards the general state of the district?—A. I thought they were trying to assault me and my forces suddenly. All these pointed that there was a widespread movement which was not confined to Amritsar alone, and that the situation was a wide military situation which was not confined to Amritsar.

Q. In taking the action which you did, did you take it upon that basis, viz., that it was not so much an Amritsar question as a question of Amritsar and district?—A. Yes, sir, absolutely. I looked upon the crowd as rebels who were trying to assault my forces, to cut me off from every place. Therefore I considered it my duty to fire on them and to fire well.

Q. Were there any other circumstances that weighed with you when you took the position to fire?—A. No, sir. I looked upon it as my duty and a very horrible duty.

Q. After the firing had taken place, I think you returned with your troops to the Rambagh?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And on counting the ammunition it was found that 1,650 rounds of ammunition had been fired?—A. Quite right.

Q. Did you ascertain the casualties?—A. I could form a rough estimate of the number from the number of rounds that was fired, and I calculated from that, roughly, that the number would be 300. I did not take it to be more than 300 casualties.

Q. You did not know that the casualties were something like 400 or 500?—A. I have seen it in the papers.

Q. You now know whether you have been informed or not? It was something between 400 and 500?—A. I have seen it in the papers. If I divided the rounds by six I should be nearer the marks than if I divided it by five.

Q. Shooting was individual and not volley shooting?—A. There was no volley shooting in the service.

Q. The crowd was very dense?—A. Very dense.

Q. It was unlikely that a man shooting into the crowd would miss?—A. No, except in certain instances as they were running a certain number of men was hit—a small percentage was hit as they were running along. In the centre of the square the crowd was very dense. There, as a man directed his fire, he should not miss.

Q. So that it is not impossible that the number of deaths should be 400 or 500 from the number of rounds?—A. Quite possible.

Q. As regards the removal of the wounded, were you in a position to render any aid?—A. No, sir, not there. I should have given aid afterwards if they asked for it. It was then not my duty to render aid. It was a medical question.

Q. Next day you issued a proclamation with reference to the burying of the dead in these terms: "The inhabitants may burn or bury their dead as soon as they please. There must be no demonstration of any kind." That was the order?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. After the firing what was the state of the city on the 14th? —A. I went through the city to see if my orders had been carried out or not. I visited the pickets. All was quiet.

Q. Martial law, I think, was actually proclaimed on the 15th? —A. Actually at Amritsar, I believe, on the 15th. It might have been later, perhaps; I cannot remember. . . .

Q. I see in your report you say that the city assumed normal conditions.—A. Yes, sir. There was absolutely no crime.

Q. If that is so, was it necessary that martial law should be proclaimed on the 15th?—A. It was. Martial law had been in existence before it was proclaimed. As they were getting better I relaxed the conditions.

Q. Martial law had *de facto* been in existence from your arrival?—A. Absolutely, sir. It had the same effect.

Q. Did you on the morning of the 14th, receive information that another meeting was to be held?—A. Yes, in the Golden Temple.

Q. What significance did you attach to that?—A. I thought that I might have to fire again perhaps at the mob. If I did so, we should have all the Sikhs complaining that I had destroyed the Golden Temple. Without firing, rumor was going abroad that I had destroyed the Golden Temple. Therefore, if I had fired on it it would be proof that I had destroyed the Golden Temple.

Q. There was no truth in the rumor that the Golden Temple had been pulled down?—A. No, sir. It was not touched in the least. I sent for Arur Singh and Sunder Singh Mojithis. One was the manager of the Golden Temple and the other, I understood, was very influential. I asked them not to allow it, and if they required any help I should be called to help them. . . .

Q. When you left, who took over the command?—A. I handed it over to Colonel Harris, of Jullundar Brigade.

Q. Have you got the letter that you referred to as regards the telegraph from General Staff?—A. I think it is with the Adjutant General or the Divisional Commander. I have not got the letter with me.

Q. I think that refers to the question of flogging. There were a number of floggings?—A. Yes, I think there were twenty-five in all.

Q. As regards flogging, that was a form of punishment which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is recognized in the army?—A. Under martial law specially.

Q. What do you say about public flogging as contrasted with private flogging?—A. As soldiers, when we lash a man we lash in public. The whole regiment is paraded and the victim is lashed in public, with a view to make an impression on every wrong-doer or to make an impression on would-be wrong-doers.

Q. You mean the maintenance of discipline in the army?—A. Yes, quite.

Q. Do you think that the same reason applies when under martial law you flog a civilian?—A. Yes, I looked upon it as the same, as it would make a good impression under martial law.

Q. Of course, according to the old civil laws this used to occur in public, but for many years they have not taken place in public. —A. I see.

Q. Were these people whipped in public?—A. Yes, but both ends of the street were closed and it did not look as a public thoroughfare.

Q. But people going that way could have seen it?—A. If they liked to go there they could have seen.

Q. People who were living there could have seen?—A. Yes.

Q. Would it not have been better if that took place in private? —A. I cannot say it. . . .

Q. Still you must admit in a large population there must have been many citizens who are not disposed to disorder but were quite willing to obey lawful orders?—A. Yes.

Q. There was that narrow minority that you had to get mastery over?—A. Unfortunately for them, owing to the wicked acts of others, they came under martial law, and if they had to look at things like that, it might have been unfortunate, but under martial law it could not have been helped.

Q. Must you not issue orders so as not to permanently alienate the people or put them out of sympathy with the administration? —A. Quite so. But we were making examples of people who were doing wrong.

Q. But you must at the same time see that you do not condemn the innocent in punishing the guilty?—A. I did not see that I was condemning the innocent.

Q. Take your orders as regards crawling. What was your object?—A. I explained that in the statement printed. I felt women had been beaten. We look upon women as sacred. I searched in my brain for a suitable punishment for these awful cases. I did not know how to meet it. There was a little bit of accident in that. Now when I visited the pickets, I went down and ordered a triangle to be erected. I felt the street ought to be looked upon as sacred. Therefore I posted pickets at both ends and told them, "No Indians are to be allowed to pass along here." I then also said if they had to pass they must go on all fours. It never entered my brain that any sensible man would under the circumstances voluntarily go through that street.

Q. You promulgated that order from the 19th to the 25th of April, and Miss Sherwood was assaulted on the 10th?—A. Yes.

Q. Should not your object have been to punish those who were guilty of assault, and so far as possible to avoid punishing those who were innocent?—A. Yes.

Q. At the street where you issued this proclamation, there are many houses abutting?—A. Yes, a good many on both sides.

Q. As I understand, there are a good many houses that had no back entrance at all?—A. I was not aware of it at the time.

Q. If it be the case that there were many of these houses that had no back entrance, what justification is there in passing an order which necessitated the inhabitants lawfully residing, to crawl on all fours when they had to leave their house?—A. They could leave at all other times. My picket was there from 6 a. m. to 8 p. m. I do not think it caused very great inconvenience. If they had suffered a little it would do no harm, under martial law. They could get necessaries of life by other means. It could not be helped if they had to suffer a slight amount of inconvenience.

Q. How could they?—A. Most of them had back entrances, I was told. Those who had to get necessaries could go and adopt improvised means or go out after 8 p.m.

Q. This order might have a very different effect from the effect which you wished; instead of being a just punishment on those who had offended, it could cause a great deal of ill-feeling among those who would resent it—the people who had not been responsible for the act that was done?—A. Amritsar behaved very badly and most of the inhabitants either gave assistance or were only waiting to see what was going to happen. They did not offer any help until after the trouble was over. If they suffered a little inconvenience it could not be helped. . . .

Q. But this street was not the street that was frequented by those who had beaten Miss Sherwood?—A. No. But I had erected a platform there in the middle of the street and thought when I got these men who had beaten her I would lash them down. I meant to lash them. I also wanted to keep the street what I called sacred. Therefore I did not want anybody to pass through it. It was an accident that these men had to pass through.

Q. There were a number of persons made to crawl?—A. I did not hear all that—if they took anybody deliberately. It was not done deliberately by me. It was a pure accident. My order was different. As they were going, my sergeant made them do what I had ordered. But I never imagined that any sensible man would go there voluntarily.

Q. If you wanted to get people away was it not a meaningless order?—A. It was only with a view to making the street what I called sacred. I was searching my brain for some suitable punishment at the time and the order made was all that I could have done.

Q. You had it enforced from the 19th to the 25th April?—A. I think that is quite right. I wanted to revoke it but I went away on the 21st, and so the order was kept in force up to that time.

Q. What led to its being superseded?—A. I received an order to that effect.

Q. If you had not received it, what was your intention?—A. Well, after I returned I presume I would have taken the pickets off. I had a great deal to think of. After the men were lashed, there was no need of keeping the pickets there.

Q. When were these six men lashed?—A. I think it was about the 20th.

Q. If it was on the 20th, there was no object in going on with that after the 20th?—A. I had overlooked the matter. There was certainly no object after these men had been lashed.

Q. As regards the men who were lashed, all of them were men who had assaulted?—A. Yes, so I am told. . . .

British Air Raids

THE following extracts from accounts in the British press of British air raids on Indian villages, appeared in a recent editorial in the *Gaelic American* (New York).

The *Daily News*, on November 28, giving the official details of the air operations against the Mahsuds, said: "Twenty-five aeroplanes dropped five tons of bombs on the Mahsuds' capital. Six hundred houses were blown to dust. Besides being bombed, the town of Makim received thousands of rounds from the Lewis guns. Further bombing raids have been carried on in the Mahsud country with great effect." The London *Times* of December 1 stated that "seventeen aeroplanes attacked Ismail Khel with a full complement of bombs." Descending to within 300 feet, they dropped four tons of bombs, leaving the villages "mere heaps of dust." On December 8 the *Times*, under the heading "Still Bombing the Mahsuds" said: "The bombing of Mahsud villages is still being carried on and will be further intensified in the near future, if no submission is made. Air operations were carried on most successfully over Sarwa Kai and Kot Kai on November 22. Telegrams of a later date than that of our correspondent report that air operations are being further carried out."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Amnesty in India

THE following important statement regarding India is included in the proclamation issued by King George with the signification of the Royal assent to the Government of India Act.

It is My earnest desire at this time that, so far as possible, any trace of bitterness between My people and those who are responsible for My government should be obliterated. Let those who, in their eagerness for political progress, have broken the law in the past respect it in the future. Let it become possible for those who are charged with the maintenance of peaceful and orderly government to forget the extravagances which they have had to curb. A new era is opening. Let it begin with a common determination among My people and My officers to work together for a common purpose. I therefore direct My Viceroy to exercise, in My name and on My behalf, My Royal clemency to political offenders, in the fullest measure which in his judgment is compatible with the public safety. I desire him to extend it, on this condition, to persons who, for offenses against the state or under any special or emergency legislation, are suffering imprisonment or restrictions upon their liberty. I trust that this leniency will be justified by the future conduct of those whom it benefits, and that all My subjects will so demean themselves as to render it unnecessary to enforce the laws for such offenses hereafter.

The Government of India Act

FOLLOWING is a summary of the chief provisions of the new Government of India Bill, which passed the House of Commons on December 5.

In each Province the Government will consist of two sections: first, the Governor with his official colleagues in the Executive Council of four members, of whom at least one must be an Indian; second, the Governor with Ministers who must either be chosen from the local legislature, or be elected members of that body within three months after appointment. Ministers will hold office during the Governor's pleasure. The local legislature is composed of the members of the Executive Council and members elected under the provisions of the Act, by an electorate numbering somewhat under two and one-half per cent. of the population.

In order to allot to each section of the dual Government its own sphere of duty, the work of the Provincial Governm[illegible] is divided into two parts: certain subjects, called "transferred subjects," will be administered by the Governor, acting with the Ministers in charge of the respective subjects—although, should the Governor dissent from the opinion of his Ministers, he may, if he sees fit, act independently—while the other Provincial matters, called "reserved subjects," will be administered by the Governor and the Executive Council.

In case the legislature shall fail to pass, in a form recommended by the Governor, any bill relating to a reserved subject, the bill will, upon the Governor's certifying that its passage is essential for the discharge of his responsibility, be deemed to have been passed. It will then be sent to the Governor-General who, in case of emergency, may approve it, whereupon it will become law, subject to disallowance by the King in Council. If no emergency exists, it must be submitted to the King and to Parliament.

The changes in the All-Indian Government provide for a larger Assembly, of more representative character than the present Assembly. It will have 120 members, as against sixty-nine at present. The Council of State is to number not more than sixty members, of whom not more than twenty shall be official. The life of the Assembly is three years; of the Council of State five years; but either may be dissolved at any time by the Governor-General, who may also, in exceptional circumstances, extend the life of either Chamber. The differences between the two Chambers will be resolved at joint sittings.

The budget will be laid before the Chamber each year, but no proposal for the appropriation of any revenues may be made except on the recommendation of the Governor-General. The Assembly is not allowed to vote on, nor may either Chamber discuss, unless the Governor-General otherwise directs, (a) appropriations for interest and sinking fund charges on loans; (b) expenditure, the amount of which is prescribed under any law; (c) salaries and pensions of persons appointed by the King or Secretary of State in Council; (d) salaries of chief commissioners and judicial commissioners, and (e) expenditure classified by order of the Governor-General in Council as ecclesiastical, political, or for defense. Should the Assembly refuse its assent to any demand for money in such cases as it is allowed to consider, or should it reduce the amount, the Governor-General in Council may, if he is satisfied that the original demand is necessary, act as if it had been assented to.

The Secretary of State in Council is empowered to make rules regulating and restricting the exercise of the general powers of control vested in superior authority, so that as India develops self-government, control from above may gradually be relaxed.

The law provides for a Statutory Commission to inquire, after ten years, into "the working of the system of government, the growth of education, and the development of representative institutions, in British India," and to report "as to whether and to what extent it is desirable to establish the principle of responsible government, or to extend, modify, or restrict the degree of responsible government then existing therein."

ALL your books can be purchased through the Readers' Service Department of *The Nation*, which is very glad to quote prices on any books in print.

You are serving *The Nation* in allowing *The Nation* to serve you.

Orders may be prepaid,* or books will be sent by express collect.

Have you seen *The Nation's* January book list?

Address orders and communications to

Readers' Service Department

The Nation

20 Vesey Street - - New York

*(Please add 5% for postage east of Chicago; 8% west.)

What about Albany?

SINCE the recent action of the New York State Assembly, people are asking with real concern, "What does Liberalism mean—Is there any tolerance in America?"

LIBERALISM IN AMERICA

Its Origin, ITS TEMPORARY COLLAPSE, Its Future

By HAROLD STEARNS

(former Associate Editor of The Dial)

Explains what Liberalism really means, and suggests how it may be restored in America. Get this stimulating book at once, at any bookstore, $1.75, or direct from the publishers, postage prepaid, $1.85.

BONI & LIVERIGHT NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED